

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

FEBRUARY 12, 2002
7:00 p.m.
---o0o---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY REBECCA ROMANO, REPORTER
CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVE. STE. 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
510.486.0700

COPY

Page 3

1 Mountain Lake. Bob Boggs, gave us an update on that.
2 We had an exhaustive description and brief history of
3 the RAB site.
4 MR. KERN: And we also talked -- and then we had
5 a little discussion of the schedule of Landfill 4 and
6 Fill Site 5.
7 MR. NELSON: So our next committee meeting is the
8 fourth Tuesday of this month, as every month. We will be
9 back at 1750, so hope to see everybody there. Thank you.
10 MR. KERN: Okay. Our next item: There was a
11 LAIR inspection by RAB members.
12 Gloria, would you kindly set it up.
13 MS. YAROS: Well, I thought it was very
14 interesting. George showed us all of the pertinent spot
15 locations and, you know, what he had described -- the work
16 he was doing. It's very interesting. The area looks much
17 bigger than it did before somehow, maybe just since
18 it's -- well, it's one giant hole. And he showed us
19 pertinent -- well, problem areas and drainage pipes that
20 were going through the various locations. And well -- to
21 describe the work that they were doing. Some of it was
22 very tedious.
23 And apparently -- well, I probably saw
24 five or six giant mounds on the other side. I didn't know
25 where they had come from. All of the old concrete was

Page 2

1 MR. KERN: Welcome to the regularly scheduled
2 meeting for the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board for
3 February 12th, 2002. Welcome to the Trust, the
4 contractors, National Park Service, Regulatory Community,
5 Community members of the board, and any members of the
6 public that are here tonight. Thanks for coming out.
7 Does everybody have an agenda? Are there any changes?
8 Any additions? Anything anyone would like to add?
9 I do want to note that under the committee business
10 and reports we should have a full description of Bob's wine
11 from our last meeting, and that's coming up.
12 Any announcements?
13 All right. Let's get on with the business.
14 MR. NELSON: On January 27th, we had discuss of
15 the RAB tour, and we also had the proposal and some wine
16 tasting. It was a pleasant evening. We also talked about
17 the RAB tour and proposal business. We had a discussion of
18 LAIR. We had only the sampling of two occasions. I think,
19 George, you were there at the meeting.
20 Were you there?
21 MR. KERN: I can't really remember who was there.
22 MR. FORD: I think I was there.
23 MR. NELSON: He gave us the talk about the
24 financial status, and the spread out of their developing to
25 keep track of everything. We had to read the discussion on

Page 4

1 being picked out of the ground, you know, shaken out of any
2 iron or debris, and then turned back into concrete.
3 MR. FORD: It was all tied up to be gravel and
4 that can be used in the new concrete.
5 MS. YAROS: Yeah. So, you know, there's a lot of
6 the work left to be done, but there's still quite a bit
7 already done, and quite interesting.
8 MR. KERN: Did he show you any pockets of green
9 goo or obnoxious material?
10 MS. YAROS: I didn't see any. We didn't see any
11 slime green. We saw red.
12 MR. FORD: We were fresh out of those.
13 MS. YAROS: There was lots of the rebar that was
14 being shaken out of the debris separated from cement and
15 dirt.
16 MR. HERMANN: So there was no sign of the steamy
17 sink holes at the destruction site?
18 MS. YAROS: No, nothing.
19 MR. FORD: But there was heat structure, though.
20 MR. HERMANN: It was interesting though beyond
21 the site which concludes what was going on.
22 MR. KERN: Did you guys have hard hats?
23 MS. YAROS: Yes.
24 MR. HERMANN: We didn't get to keep them.
25 MR. FORD: We are working on that part.

Page 5

1 MR. NELSON: We are going to have disposable ones,
 2 eventually.
 3 MR. YAROS: Oxymoron: disposables.
 4 MR. KERN: What about the oak tree?
 5 MS. YAROS: That was really a sight, a really
 6 giant, old oak tree that had been moved.
 7 MR. HERMANN: A hundred tons, I think, it was a
 8 hundred ten tons.
 9 MR. NELSON: I don't remember.
 10 MR. FORD: I think he said it was over a hundred
 11 tons.
 12 MR. HERMANN: It was over a hundred tons.
 13 MR. FORD: They moved it about 150 feet.
 14 Actually, it had been done before the RAB members got
 15 there.
 16 MR. HERMANN: I didn't get to see it.
 17 MS. YAROS: We are talking about a big, big old
 18 tree. There was a smaller one, too, that they had moved.
 19 It was something as big as a small house, but this was
 20 major.
 21 MR. HERMANN: I forgot it was probably filled
 22 with root.
 23 MS. YAROS: 22 feet of root.
 24 MR. FORD: That sounds about right. The amazing
 25 thing is the tree still looks good. It was pulled out of

Page 6

1 the ground and sat in a box for a while. It was moved 150
 2 feet and put back in the ground, and the leaves are still
 3 green. I mean, it looks like it's doing okay.
 4 MR. HERMANN: It looks good for 100 years old.
 5 MR. FORD: It's kind of in the southwest corner
 6 of the site, not too far from O'Rielly Avenue, which is the
 7 street that goes along the west side of the site.
 8 It's an oak. The two oaks were, I guess, within the
 9 footprint of where the new buildings are going to go. They
 10 just moved it the minimum distance to keep them out in the
 11 yard outside the building footprint. And it's just -- I
 12 guess the oaks are considered a cultural --
 13 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was heritage.
 14 MR. HERMANN: Weren't they the last two?
 15 MR. NELSON: I think there's a mitigation issue.
 16 EIS, when they were doing work to the building, they
 17 have to keep this oak tree there and move it, if necessary.
 18 MR. HERMANN: It's one of the last examples on
 19 the Presidio.
 20 MR. NELSON: I think in that area for sure, yeah.
 21 MR. KERN: Excellent. Thank you.
 22 MS. YAROS: You are welcome.
 23 MR. KERN: Any other committee business?
 24 Okay. Let's move on to Item 5A: Reports and
 25 Discussions with Craig and "Strategy of Data Information."

Page 7

1 MR. COOPER: That's kind of a vague agenda item.
 2 I think it was at the last RAB committee meeting, there was
 3 some discussion about, I think -- the real crux of the
 4 issue I'm talking about is I would like to bring people's
 5 attention to the handouts on the assignment table. At this
 6 handout here. And there was some RAB members that brought
 7 up the question of -- they want to know when documents have
 8 been sent to the library so we know when they are sent
 9 there. And we would like to know a little bit, you know,
 10 in advance of, you know, one or two sentences about what
 11 that document is about before we go through the trouble of
 12 getting in our car and going over to the Trust Library to
 13 go look at it.
 14 So I think that's what I volunteered to take a stab
 15 at. A couple procedures that we at the Presidio Trust will
 16 follow in order to notify them. It's written for really --
 17 so I can hand it out to other project managers at the
 18 Presidio Trust. But when you read this, you will see how
 19 RAB members will be notified through e-mails basically when
 20 documents are sent over to the library. I think everyone
 21 knows where the Presidio Trust Library is. It's
 22 Building 34.
 23 So basically it's pretty self-explanatory. Step 1, a
 24 Trust Project Manager, is now ready to issue a document out
 25 whether it being a draft or final document. A document

Page 8

1 could either be a workplan, such as a sample plan to try
 2 to, you know, take samples for contaminated samples or a
 3 data report. It could be any type of Remediation Program
 4 Document, draft or final. And a copy of it gets sent out
 5 to -- such as Bob and other people, and one goes directly
 6 to Doug and Mark, but also a copy goes to Barbara Janis,
 7 and that's our Trust librarian.
 8 So then step 2 because Barbara really -- when she gets
 9 the documents, she really doesn't know. She knows what the
 10 title is and the date is, but she doesn't know how to
 11 describe it so -- well, the Trust Project Manager will send
 12 her an e-mail, to say this is what this document is about.
 13 And step 3, Barbara will then send out kind of a
 14 group-wide distribution notice to RAB members and copy
 15 everybody else saying there is now a document at the
 16 library. This is the title, this is the date, and this is
 17 one or two, you know, sentences that describes what it's
 18 about, and so then you will know in a very real-time
 19 fashion. If you check your e-mails, you will see e-mails
 20 from Barbara Janis. You will know that's a document from
 21 the Presidio Trust.
 22 MR. KERN: Dave.
 23 MR. SUTTER: There was an associated question
 24 when we discussed whether it would be possible on various
 25 reports for there to be Executive Summaries that would be

Page 9

1 issued to the RAB, and I believe that we agreed to think
2 about that.

3 MR. COOPER: Right.

4 MR. SUTTER: And I'm just wondering if you
5 thought about it.

6 MR. COOPER: We thought about it. I can kick
7 around a couple pros and cons. Just this step makes me a
8 little bit nervous because I don't feel an Executive
9 Summary -- what I think -- what I prefer to do, David, is
10 once you see an e-mail and you see that the document's are
11 there and whether you had chance to go look at it or not.
12 If it looks like a document that you want to be discussed,
13 I recommend that we put it on as an agenda for formal
14 discussion among everybody. And then we can talk it about
15 it at a RAB, because the downside on Executive Summaries is
16 that Craig Cooper will write the Executive Summary, and it
17 may be slightly different than how Doug might perceive the
18 document. So I don't want to, because you are only given
19 an Executive Summary, a couple -- maybe one paragraph to
20 try to nutshell what the whole document is about. That's
21 difficult to do. I don't want to mislead you or, you know,
22 something like -- keeping something too simple.

23 So I would prefer not to do Executive Summaries. And
24 if it's a document that we want to talk about, let's put it
25 on the agenda and talk about it in front of everybody; then

Page 10

1 the Trust will be more than happy to do so. I will give it
2 to a Trust Project Manager, and you can discuss the
3 document, and then if you want to ask Brian his opinion of
4 it or Doug -- or anybody else they can chime in. And that
5 would be my recommendation.

6 So in the e-mail, you will get at least one or
7 two sentences about what it's about, but I'm nervous to do
8 an Executive Summary.

9 MR. HERMANN: How about a brief description?

10 MR. COOPER: A brief description is in the
11 e-mail.

12 MR. HERMANN: Well, better than that. The
13 subject financial document advised through groundwater
14 (INAUDIBLE) What are the results, you know, how did they
15 stay and all this can be done. It's not an opinion. It's
16 open or can be open to discussion. And will give us more
17 of an idea of what that whole document is about rather than
18 tables and tables of groundwater results. When I go over
19 there and look at them, I'm not going to know what they
20 are.

21 MS. YAROS: I agree with him. I really hope this
22 won't be tables. I think it's something we really need to
23 think about, because it's a tremendous amount of
24 information.

25 MR. COOPER: It is.

Page 11

1 MS. YAROS: We are not scientists, or I'm not, at
2 least. It would be very helpful and, you know, actually --
3 as far as, you know, just a one-person summary, I think
4 it's suggested that we maybe have two persons -- or various
5 people feel that the crux of this study or their conclusion
6 is two or three people. If you think that's the problem of
7 having just one person summaries.

8 MR. SUTTER: I presume -- correct me if I am
9 wrong -- that the bulk of these reports are produced by
10 consultants that you have under contract?

11 MR. COOPER: Yes.

12 MR. SUTTER: I would not want to suggest that the
13 Presidio Staff take on more work in this regard, but, you
14 know, since consultants are doing the reports anyway, maybe
15 it might be feasible to talk to them about the possibility
16 of producing these Executive Summaries on an ongoing basis
17 as they produce the reports. They must have to do this
18 kind of thing for other clients that they contract with.
19 And what Joel says just basically a summary of what the
20 positive and negative results of a particular sampling
21 program or groundwater, periodic Groundwater Monitoring
22 Program.

23 MR. HERMANN: Maybe it seems too efficient. All
24 we want is a brief description. We are not going to hold
25 anybody to just some indication of what's going on.

Page 12

1 MS. YAROS: Right.

2 MR. SUTTER: Whatever the results are, whether
3 they are good, bad, or indifferent.

4 MS. HARRIS: You know, I guess I'm sitting here
5 with sort of mixed emotions about that, but my sense would
6 be -- or at least what I would be willing to do is to go
7 ahead with the two or three sentences for now. We'll try
8 it out, see if this gives us the information we want, and
9 if not, then we come back again to talk about information
10 in the Executive Summary, because right now I don't know
11 whether this is sufficient information for me or not.

12 I have not seen the documents. I have not read the
13 documents. I am not sure, but I am willing to take this
14 and see if two or three sentences would give me what I
15 wanted, and if not, then I think we should come back and
16 review it again. I don't know. I'm kind of mixed about
17 it.

18 MR. SUTTER: It might be useful for the Trust as
19 well; not just to disseminate Executive Summaries with
20 indications of the results of the test, but as something to
21 be able to share with the general public should questions
22 arise.

23 MR. COOPER: Uh-huh.

24 MR. SUTTER: I just kind of have a feeling that
25 this would be a very useful mechanism for everybody

Page 13

1 involved, and it could very easily enable the Trust to
2 answer any questions that might be posed by neighborhood
3 associations or other public groups that have an interest
4 in what might be going on.

5 MR. KERN: One of the things I found over the
6 years of reviewing these things is that you wouldn't want
7 to rely on any kind of a summary, or perhaps another word
8 might be "abstract." I mean something that turned out to
9 be a paragraph.

10 It would be very challenging to summarize something
11 into a paragraph or two. I mean something could be done --
12 something like a Groundwater Report, that's this thick of
13 20 different sites.

14 This is a Groundwater Report. It has the data from
15 all this. I mean you couldn't really say much more than
16 that, because once you started to say anything about the
17 data, you just got that whole report and a lot of the data.
18 Maybe what you are asking is, was there anything really
19 unusual that was found?

20 MS. YAROS: Uh-huh.

21 MR. KERN: I think that could be done. Well, you
22 know, it was -- boiling lava came out of it one day or
23 something. There hasn't really -- usually been something
24 incredibly extraordinary that happens. I suppose that
25 could be done as part of something out of the ordinary, but

Page 15

1 hundred pages. An office sampling reporter looking at well
2 over thousands of data points -- by the time you get
3 different analysis together and trying to, you know, a few
4 paragraphs summarize it is tough, but in the report it's
5 broken up by site so there's a subsection tab for free
6 site.

7 Within that there is a discussion of key findings
8 for that site, and that can range anywhere from a paragraph
9 to a page. And I'm just thinking even if you were to take
10 that, you still would have over 20 pages.

11 MR. SUTTER: Uh-huh.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: And it may be helpful, as Craig
13 suggested, once we all become familiar with the different
14 things that we are interested in. And somebody here, maybe
15 you're interested in Landfill 1. That can easily go in
16 that section.

17 The section's, you know, a half-inch thick. You can
18 flip through to find the page that describes what is the
19 interesting things in that site. There's maps that show
20 your water levels, full-page maps. And that might be more
21 illustrative than any one of us taking and trying to boil
22 everything into five or ten pages. You couldn't have the
23 maps in those. Those are the ones that tell the story, if
24 you are interested in groundwater direction.

25 MR. SUTTER: But again, the key findings on a

Page 14

1 then, of course, subject to the interpretation what is
2 really unusual.

3 MR. COOPER: If I could recommend a compromise
4 for everyone to consider. We have a standing-agenda item
5 in the RAB agenda that will say, "Documents released in the
6 last months." And they will be listed, and then you've
7 already got the e-mails about them and the brief
8 description, and then we can, you know -- then we can ask
9 RAB members. You don't have to tell us in advance.

10 Hopefully between George, myself, and Chris and Brian,
11 that show up -- we'll be able to tell you right then and
12 there, you know, verbally, yeah, that document was about
13 blah, blah, blah, and so then it becomes a standing-agenda
14 item.

15 MR. SUTTER: Not to beat this horse to death, but
16 I think really the last meeting -- and what I am looking
17 for is, as you mentioned, an exception report. Is there
18 something that particular sampling program or this
19 particular groundwater monitoring analysis has discovered
20 that's of concern?

21 And then, of course, that item will become actionable
22 and whatever ongoing remediation efforts apply to it.
23 That's really what I'm looking for.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: You know, I think in some regard
25 the Groundwater Report -- it's a big, thick report over a

Page 16

1 particular monitoring well or group of wells indicates, you
2 know, no deviations from previous findings. Everything is
3 within regulatory limits.

4 You know, that isn't something I want to see
5 necessarily. What I would want to see in key findings is
6 if there's an exception. There's something out of the
7 limit, or is it a potential trend for a certain metal or
8 toxic or hazardous material to potentially go out of the
9 limit. That's the kind of information that I think would
10 be useful to both the RAB and questions that arise from
11 community groups and such. That would be very helpful in
12 just highlighting any potential problems and, of course,
13 you know the Remedial Actions that the Trust can take.
14 I mean -- I don't know -- maybe I'm missing something,
15 but it doesn't seem to me that that would be too difficult
16 for consultants who do these studies and reports to include
17 maybe a very, short exception report.

18 MR. COOPER: In speaking of groundwater, there's
19 a lot of interest on groundwater. Since I am new to the
20 group, has someone from the Presidio Trust given an
21 overview of our Groundwater Monitoring Program and, you
22 know, what it's about and what are the key findings so far
23 to date? Because I talked to Jennifer Coats from the
24 Presidio Trust, who kind of is the Project Manager for the
25 Routine Water Managing Program. She said she would be able

Page 17

1 to come and -- would be willing to come and present the RAB
2 with, you know, kinds of -- something that you are looking
3 for like what you are talking about.

4 First, an overview of what we are doing. What is our
5 extensive network, and what kinds of wells they are, and
6 what are some trends of the water quality trends that we
7 have done so far in the groundwater at the Presidio.

8 Again, I think that we can try to do that, but it would
9 need to be done in a presentation form. We can get some
10 maps up on display for looking at visually. If that's
11 something, you know, the RAB is interested in, we can
12 probably get that, you know, for the March or April.

13 MS. CHEEVER: I think that would be pressing
14 topics. It wouldn't be very interesting for both new and
15 old RAB members to educate yourself better, but decide what
16 documents we do want to look into. I think, groundwater is
17 just kind of the crept. As an example, not necessarily
18 what we are most interested in. It's something -- not the
19 only thing, we are interested in.

20 MR. HERMANN: Right, right.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Just to follow up on your
22 standing-agenda item, is it automatically discussed or only
23 if the people want to?

24 MR. COOPER: Only if you people wanted to.

25 MS. CHEEVER: As we mentioned last month, if you

Page 19

1 anything here at the meeting. And it would be much more
2 convenient when we have the time and you could just get it
3 on your computer.

4 I don't know whether that's a big deal. It would seem
5 to me a cumbersome report eventually needs to be archived
6 electronically.

7 MR. FORD: There's been a ton of discussion
8 within the Trust the last couple of months just about this
9 issue, and it's come up for two reasons: One, because we
10 recognize that a lot of this stuff -- it's just so much
11 more excessive, I believe, if it's on the web.

12 The other reason it's come up, we have a directive
13 that our Web site, and any electronic documents that we
14 post there have to be Section 508 compliant, which we are
15 just learning about. Section 508 compliance, it has to do
16 with, I believe, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and
17 it means that documents that get posted on the Web and the
18 Web site itself have to meet certain requirements. And I
19 can tell you right now that I don't believe our Web site is
20 508 compliant. And I know that's the type that's put up
21 there, but I don't think the overall Web site, itself, is.
22 And at the moment, we don't have the ability to post
23 environmental documents in a 508 compliant format.

24 We are going to solve all those problems, and
25 eventually we will be posting the vast majority of stuff on

Page 18

1 could bring at least some of the most important documents
2 of the past month and people can glance at them, because I
3 think it's hard to get to the library.

4 MR. COOPER: Okay.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Will we have a chance to glance at
6 examples of the documents here and at committee meetings,
7 it would help people to develop their own thoughts about
8 which ones they want to look at in more detail.

9 MR. COOPER: Then let's do that. We will follow
10 these procedures as far getting e-mails out about the short
11 description. We will follow the standing-agenda item so on
12 the agenda it will actually provide -- it will say
13 documents released since the last RAB meeting, and it will
14 have the name and dates of it.

15 Jane, since you will be updating the e-mail list, you
16 can track those and fit them right into our agenda. We can
17 bring them to the meeting and just set them out on the
18 table. You can flip through them. If somebody wants to
19 talk about -- well, yeah, I want to talk about this third
20 document that was released, then we can spend five or ten
21 minutes and explain what that document is about.

22 MR. BERMAN: Is there any plan on this -- on
23 these reports that any of it is available electrically then
24 one could look at it and say the specific portions that
25 we're mentioning and, you know, it's hard to really study

Page 20

1 the Web site, but it's kind of a tricky process at least
2 right now. So you are going to be doing -- I think it's
3 going to be happening pretty slowly.

4 MR. BERMAN: One of the ways of getting around
5 some of those requirements is to have the documents only
6 accessed, I believe, by special permission. And then you
7 can get away from things like Disabilities Act problems.

8 So if the RAB members had a code that these documents
9 that were only available to, say, a certain number of
10 people, then you can just press in the code on the computer
11 and you can get access. I believe those don't have to
12 satisfy the safety requirements.

13 MR. FORD: Well, we kind of -- we talked around a
14 lot of the options and that hasn't been one of them, but I
15 think we are willing to consider anything. So we will have
16 to look into that.

17 MR. KERN: So between Gloria, David, and Joel,
18 how are you feeling about where we are on this topic?

19 MR. HERMANN: I feel like we are moving. I feel
20 like I'm going to be getting some more information that I
21 need.

22 MR. KERN: Okay. David?

23 MR. SUTTER: I'm not yet satisfied.

24 MR. KERN: Okay.

25 MR. SUTTER: Something more cannot be done

Page 21

1 without a lot of effort.

2 MR. KERN: I'm going to make a little suggestion
3 that perhaps, you know, you get a document at one of the
4 next meetings and kind of work through or work with Craig
5 and say, well, this is what I would have wanted, and see if
6 maybe -- if we can do that. Or what kind of work ethic
7 that would do.

8 MR. FORD: Doug, you are sort of headed in the
9 same direction I was thinking. I think sometimes a
10 discussion like that can get bogged down. You are talking
11 about a hypothetical.

12 What I would suggest you give us a try. Let us do
13 what Craig has proposed, you know, for the next month, and
14 then we can come back next month and talk about it, and you
15 will have seen what we are putting out by then. You can
16 either say this is absolutely what we want, or we got to do
17 something more or, you know, you may find I think after
18 hearing comments, we are definitely going to be stretching
19 ourselves as far as putting together these summaries. My
20 guess is they might be longer than a line or two. And
21 after you had a chance to look at them let's come back and
22 see, and maybe they won't be very far apart, maybe the
23 problem will be taken care of, but if it isn't, you can let
24 us know.

25 MS. HARRIS: Well, I'm glad we went all around

Page 23

1 entire Battery Howe/Wagner site, which led us, I believe,
2 to some other source of carbon in the groundwater, either
3 other than or in addition to the Battery Howe/Wagner Soil
4 Gas Investigation site, which hasn't been determined
5 definitively whether Battery Howe/Wagner itself is the
6 source.

7 For those of who you are planning to review the
8 forthcoming draft Feasibility Studies, the findings are in
9 there. If I can summarize them in one sentence, I would
10 say the findings are relatively inconclusive whether or not
11 this site, Battery Howe/Wagner Soil Gas Investigation, is a
12 source, because there was no carbon tetra chloride, I
13 believe, found inside of the samples. There was no
14 compounds in some of the samples, but there's no smoking
15 gun showing a definitive source of any VOCs in the
16 groundwater or on the soil gas investigation at the
17 site.

18 So future details will be summarized in the FS. If
19 anyone has any questions, we can answer them now or we can
20 continue.

21 MS. YAROS: I would just like to say you are
22 getting very close to what we want in the Executive
23 Summary.

24 MR. COOPER: Okay.

25 MS. YAROS: Maybe another sentence or two and we

Page 22

1 the block and came back to what I had suggested in the
2 beginning.

3 MR. KERN: With your permission, let us move to
4 5B. That would be Chris.

5 MR. NELSON: I'm going to talk about primarily
6 the CERCLA or Superfund Program Projects.

7 So here goes. On the Feasibility Study, the
8 Battery Howe/Wagner Soil Gas Investigation, there was a
9 draft report submitted to the stakeholders on January 23rd,
10 which I believe was a day after that meeting. We had a
11 RAB committee meeting, and I noticed today that there had
12 been no e-mails sent out about that. So I took it upon
13 myself to send out an announcement. I think it was
14 yesterday by e-mail that it was available. I sent it to
15 the RAB, assuming that Bob and Jim had already got their
16 copies and, I believe, Mark and Doug probably as well.

17 If anybody has any questions about what that report
18 says, I would be glad to go over it briefly. That was a
19 Soil Gas Investigation Battery Howe/Wagner conducted last
20 fall. We were trying to determine whether or not there was
21 some source of carbon tetra chloride, which is a chloride
22 solvent which has shown up fairly consistent in the
23 groundwater for Battery Howe/Wagner for several years.

24 However, when we put in some of the wells in 2000, we
25 found an upgradient an uphill hydraulic leak from the

Page 24

1 could have that particular problem solved.

2 What is the expert's opinion on this particular site?
3 If it looks okay? I mean, we didn't find any plutonium
4 here, or we only found a tiny bit, or we need further
5 study? I mean, that's, you know --

6 MR. NELSON: You point out something that I
7 choose to remain silent on. There's nothing simple about
8 the Presidio, unfortunately.

9 Environmental reports here can sometimes be summarized
10 in that way. I would not want to call myself an expert,
11 and definitely say there's no reason to be alarmed. I
12 think the biggest head scratcher about this report is we
13 hope to find some sort of source that would indicate where
14 this contamination is coming from. We cannot find it from
15 this report, and so it's kind of up in the air. What's
16 going to happen? Is this issue going to stay forever
17 connected with Battery Howe/Wagner? Are we going to be
18 able to decouple it somehow? Look elsewhere in the area?
19 That's sort of an issue where I cannot say one way or the
20 other whether there's been a determination.

21 MS. YAROS: But you can give your opinion and say
22 it's your opinion.

23 MR. NELSON: Yeah.

24 MS. YAROS: I think we want an Executive Summary.
25 We can make a decision on what our opinion is about that

Page 25

1 particular site.

2 Do you agree with that?

3 MR. COOPER: We would like to do it verbally just
4 as Chris did. That way Bob and Jim may have a likely
5 different, you know, explanation. They get to give you
6 that information at the same time. And so, anyway, not to
7 digress into the other agenda item, that's my only concern.

8 MS. YAROS: I need it written.

9 MR. COOPER: Okay.

10 MR. KERN: Thank you for your positive comments.
11 I appreciate that.

12 MR. BERMAN: I know you already summarized the
13 report, but the question still up in the air on is, where
14 is the source of the carbon tetra chloride? And so the
15 question is, what is your plan on pursuing to find out what
16 that is? And that's one question.

17 Second question is, given that we know what's
18 happening with ARARs, do you think you are going to be able
19 to decouple this issue?

20 MR. NELSON: Those are two very good questions.
21 The first question I do not have an answer for because
22 there has not been a determination made one way or the
23 other how we are intending to proceed. I think we are
24 hoping to get some feedback from Jim and Bob, and perhaps
25 with putting our heads together we can come up with a

Page 27

1 have been. We haven't given up yet.

2 MR. BERMAN: If that was what happened then,
3 there should be a gradual decay presumably over a period of
4 time in the groundwater, right? If there's a source -- if
5 it all leaked out, wouldn't you think if you periodically
6 examine it you would see a slow decay of the composition?

7 MR. COOPER: Let's look at the groundwater
8 quality trends, but I'm not a groundwater expert. I would
9 have a groundwater hydraulic there, and I would see if
10 there's enough clean groundwater coming in to -- flushing
11 out the remaining groundwater contamination.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Today with the Army and with the
13 Trust sampling there is an apparent decrease in training,
14 and it's been going on for probably on the order of
15 seven or eight years.

16 MR. NELSON: We did find the highest
17 concentration closest to the smoking gun. We couldn't
18 find, but nothing in the soil. And when we did sampling of
19 the test pits in April of last year, we did take soil
20 samples. We didn't find any carbon tetra chloride. That's
21 another way of looking for the source and not being able to
22 couple it to the Battery Howe/Wagner site itself.

23 MR. PONTON: That was (INAUDIBLE)

24 MR. NELSON: Massive contamination in the soil.

25 MR. PONTON: Was your focus -- did you analyze

Page 26

1 proposal of how to deal with it.

2 With the ARARs, I'm not sure you can try to decouple
3 the issue. Craig or Brian may want to say, one way or the
4 other, whether we could. I think it's more of an issue of
5 where the source is. If somebody or everybody believes
6 it's not Battery Howe/Wagner, then how can you not decouple
7 it? It's not to say because we haven't found a source we
8 are not interested in finding; it's just we really need to
9 put our heads together and look at historic records of all
10 the buildings in the area. Anything that was suspected of
11 having any chemical use whatsoever was highlighted, and
12 sampling locations were chosen and reviewed by the
13 stakeholders to try and determine whether or not the source
14 could be found.

15 My guess is certainly Building 1233, where there was
16 at least one documented spill of carbon tetra chloride, is
17 a partial source, but maybe it's all dissolved in the
18 ground into the groundwater. It's not the soil anymore.
19 We may never find the source.

20 MR. COOPER: That can sometimes happen with
21 (INAUDIBLE) If they're old enough, it all leaks down, and
22 it's in the groundwater, but the residual in the soil is so
23 small. It's just basically all been washed away and that
24 sometimes happens. I'm not saying that this happened at
25 this particular source, but there are scenarios that might

Page 28

1 filaments for other VOCs? Was anything else detected?

2 MR. NELSON: There was some others detected, all
3 quite low, and I can't remember off the top of my head
4 which ones they were.

5 MR. PONTON: We don't see them in this
6 groundwater?

7 MR. NELSON: I think the only other thing that
8 showed up (INAUDIBLE) or something, it doesn't have
9 consistent VOCs in the groundwater at the site. It's been
10 carbon tetra chloride that's been sort of the main player
11 out there. Anything else may also be fracture flow in the
12 groundwater which could cause the soil to --

13 MR. PONTON: Wells are completed in the sediment
14 above the basement?

15 MR. NELSON: I think they're in the contract --
16 either in the summer or depending what was placed there.

17 MR. PONTON: What was the depth of the water?

18 MR. NELSON: I don't know off the top of my head.
19 It's probably 30 feet or so in some of the wells.

20 MR. BERMAN: How many feet?

21 MR. NELSON: Roughly 30 feet.

22 Any more questions on that?

23 I appreciate all the interest. That was certainly
24 more than I anticipated.

25 MS. YAROS: You never know.

Page 29

1 MR. NELSON: Moving right along. A report that I
2 can't say too much about is the Field Samples Agendum
3 No. 4, the sampling report for the work that was done in
4 November. That's currently undergoing a review and
5 response to comments by the Trust response to Park Service
6 comments, and this document should be available to
7 stakeholders later this month.

8 And the original plan with that document was -- we
9 thought the FS was going to come out ahead of it.
10 Therefore, the data would be sort of appendix. The way
11 things are going, it looks like we probably will be able to
12 report all of the data in terms of posting it on the maps
13 and then the tables and identify any new COCs; that's
14 chemicals of concern. We will be able to get FS itself,
15 sort of caught up. And that's good.

16 Any questions on that document?

17 Keep your eyes peeled on your e-mails then.

18 On the Feasibility Study Report itself, there were
19 comments provided by Brian on the version of the document
20 that was revised from last meeting. Brian and I met to
21 discuss these transmitted from EKI, and we anticipate being
22 able to release the document early this year March, April
23 time frame perhaps March.

24 The ARARs, that's a section on the Feasibility Study.
25 The section itself is Section 7. It was released last

Page 31

1 ARARs. I'm willing to wait until that comes up.

2 MR. FORD: Do you want to hear it now or when we
3 talk about it later?

4 MS. CHEEVER: When we talk about it later.

5 MR. FORD: Yeah, we can talk about that.

6 MS. WRIGHT: Are we close on the file agreement?

7 MR. NELSON: My understanding is that our lawyer
8 has agreed to what we sent to Brian Ullensvang with the
9 Park Service. Brian will take that to Brian O'Neil next
10 Thursday. And if Brian O'Neil approves it, I understand
11 that that will be that. If Brian has comments, we can go
12 back.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Okay.

14 MR. NELSON: So that's not to indicate that any
15 one party or individual or agency is responsible for
16 delays. That's the time line at this point.

17 MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

18 MR. NELSON: We are very hopeful to have a
19 conclusion that we can be happy with.

20 MS. WRIGHT: Send us an e-mail if that goes
21 through.

22 MR. NELSON: There will be a big party at a final
23 meeting.

24 MR. FORD: With directions to the bar?

25 MR. NELSON: It's on the corner of Baker and

Page 30

1 summer for review by the state agencies and the
2 RAB members. I know I mentioned this many times before.
3 ARARs are essentially the laws that we have to comply with
4 when conducting remedial action. It stands for Applicable
5 or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement. We did receive
6 comments from both state agencies, January and December
7 respectively. DTSC and Regional Boards and the Trust and
8 the Park Service have been working to come to an agreement
9 on which ARARs -- how ARARs are going to be presented in
10 the test case Fill Site 5, Landfill 4 wrap.

11 Once that process is approached, it should be
12 relatively straightforward to put in the main instillation
13 for ARARs some of the other upcoming documents.

14 MR. KERN: I think this is an appropriate time to
15 wail away on the Landfill Fill Site 5 issue.

16 MR. NELSON: I think the guy three people to the
17 right is the appropriate person to wail on about that.

18 MR. KERN: Timing-wise, do we have any other
19 comments that could take a couple hours?

20 MR. FORD: Well, I was going to touch on 4 and 5.
21 It's the last slide. I was hoping everybody would be
22 exhausted by that time that -- would be my guess.

23 MR. KERN: We could wait as long as we get to
24 that.

25 MS. CHEEVER: I would be interested about the

Page 32

1 Lombard. It's a sports bar. They have free popcorn, pool
2 tables, pizza, you know, the whole deal.

3 MR. FORD: They need adult supervision. They
4 can't get together without other people being in the room.

5 MR. NELSON: It's been very cordial.

6 A qualifying statement about this last bulletin on
7 ARARs. When I say "proposed ARARs" since we did receive
8 the agencies' comments, we have been revising what we have
9 been doing internally. We are hoping to incorporate the
10 agencies' comments about the emerging ARARs and that comes
11 out in the draft as best. So hopefully that will be a very
12 brief review for the agencies, and they will see that we
13 addressed the comments or explained why we didn't address
14 them or whatever ended up happening there.

15 Anymore questions about ARARs?

16 MR. KERN: We reserve the right to come back.

17 MR. NELSON: Duly noted.

18 The Cleanup Level Document, which is a document that
19 covers Presidio cleanup levels in soils, sediments, and
20 surface water and groundwater. We received comments from
21 that document in November and met with the agencies to
22 discuss the comments in December. We have been working out
23 some of the kinks and last week we had a successful meeting
24 with DTSC and the Regional Board, to discuss our
25 understanding of the DTSC comments and how we intend to

Page 33

1 move forward. It's coming down to proposing a table that
2 will be -- sort of a one-stop shopping place. How to make
3 risk management decisions and allowing comfort levels on
4 the cleanup levels that we presented.

5 At this time, we are working towards getting that
6 table ready by next week, along with a response to comments
7 on all of the comments that we were provided by DTSC. And
8 then hopefully if that's acceptable, all the decisions that
9 we made and we are all in cooperation on that and then we
10 can move forward and issue the document next month. So
11 that's the plan on that.

12 Are there any questions on the cleanup levels?

13 MR. BERMAN: Was there anything in the DTSC
14 comments that was in major disagreement with the
15 preliminary levels that you had given?

16 MR. NELSON: Yeah, sort of, but I think that
17 through some closer looks at the numbers and some
18 discussions with Bob, who's ultimately the rising man on
19 the project and has the ability to say, you know, I agree
20 with the risk management decision, or I want to see a
21 different number that's lower -- I think we are going to
22 come to a good position where the Trust feels at least the
23 numbers are protected and appropriate. So I don't think we
24 are going to see any further delays on that. I'll keep my
25 fingers crossed.

Page 34

1 MR. BERMAN: Well, I was just wondering if
2 there's a lot of different numbers or if it's just one or
3 two, if there was a couple that were really a major
4 difference whether you would be willing to tell us what
5 they were?

6 MR. NELSON: Well, largely what it came down to
7 was the issue of the ecological cleanup levels in the soil.
8 And there was an approach that was used to base the cleanup
9 level number on, an arithmetic mean between a low exposure
10 number and a high exposure number.

11 In some cases, it's a difference between the low
12 number and the high number, whichever was greater in order
13 of the magnitude our consultants developed for some
14 compounds. The lithology of developing special status
15 species numbers that were intended to be more protected.
16 Specifically, the special status species numbers were going
17 to be protected. A special status species endangered
18 plants and also protected for individual species. So that
19 was one of the things that came out in the document, you
20 know, before DTSC commented on what we did.

21 In other cases, we have been comparing the numbers
22 with what they mean, and if we were only to go with the low
23 or the mean, and then how would that have an impact. When
24 you think about the Presidio soils, there are four major
25 lithology groups: The Beach/Dune, the Colma, the

Page 35

1 Serpentinities and the Chert/Shale soils. They all have
2 different numbers -- or actually metals as well as
3 different numbers. And subsequently, if a number for, say,
4 human health -- the cleanup level for residential is lower
5 than the background number or even if the ecological number
6 is lower than the background number, then what we could do
7 is default to the background number for the lithology.

8 MR. BERMAN: Well, no one can argue with that.

9 MR. NELSON: Right, right. It's not reasonable
10 to ask us to clean up to a -- greater than or less than
11 background.

12 MR. COOPER: DTSC commented that they were
13 determined that the process by using the average of the
14 mean would sometimes be equivalent to close to the eco high
15 number. So what they've asked us to do is take a look at
16 our process and put the highs and the lows together and to
17 make sure that we multiply -- keeping our numbers
18 (INAUDIBLE). And you can tell that, you know, when we had
19 that effort -- when we did have a process to bracket it
20 back down closer to the eco low and greater than a
21 magnitude between ten. And between the two, we are taking
22 a second look at this process just to make sure there isn't
23 any outliers, to make sure there isn't anything else that
24 slipped through the cracks, basically.

25 And Bob if you wanted to add anything.

Page 36

1 MR. BOGGS: I think that's a pretty good summary
2 of our comments and policies of an ecological risk
3 accesser. How they come up with these two numbers is
4 scientific data, and they have no effects on any number.
5 We know if we clean it up to this number, it's not going to
6 have any effects. Then we have a low effects number.
7 We're first starting to see effects on critters with these
8 things.

9 With what the Trust has done for the most part is kind
10 of average those two numbers. It's lower than where we
11 clearly see scientific effects, but it's higher than a
12 number where we see no effects. And what our Risk Accesser
13 wants us to do is take a look at these side by side on an
14 individual basis. And so we kind of flagged this and
15 brought this up based on -- there are a couple of the
16 compounds in particular; mercury is one of them. If we use
17 the average, it comes up with a level of 5.2. If you use
18 the low number, it's 0.4.

19 In his knowledge of the effects on these things in
20 working with the Fish and Game, he says we won't buy off on
21 5.2. The highest background sample anywhere in the
22 Presidio was 0.2, so if we are cleaning up to 0.4, we are
23 not really risking cleaning up any background. It's
24 probably some kind of a source of mercury. Conversely with
25 nickel, if you come up with a number with an average of 250

Page 37

1 or something like that -- so Fill Site 5, where half the
 2 landfill features in with half the Serpentine and the
 3 Beach/Dune, if we use that number of 246, it's probably too
 4 conservative, because it's just 5 feet away and these
 5 critters can be exposed to 4,500, and that's what the
 6 background is for Serpentine. So you need to look at it
 7 as a risk manager here and say okay, this site is right
 8 next to Serpentine, and it doesn't make any sense to keep
 9 cleaning it when these critters don't know fences and to
 10 try and clean up the sand ten yards away at 256 -- So there
 11 we would have the high level for the Beach/Dunes, because
 12 it's right next to Serpentine. If you just wanted to add
 13 that level (INAUDIBLE) because we could do risk assessments
 14 for essentially all the military sites in the state. He
 15 wants the risk managers to know the specifics about the
 16 individual sites and that sort of thing to decide what the
 17 con and pro number is between the high and the low. And I
 18 think, as Craig said, we kind of got to a table -- got to a
 19 consensus on how we are going to move forward.

20 We should have one more meeting to run everything by
 21 Jim Paulson. We should be coming to some consensus on
 22 which numbers are appropriate.

23 MR. KERN: Thanks Bob.

24 MR. COOPER: That was an Executive Summary.

25 MR. NELSON: I'm going to move on. Any

Page 39

1 Trust. And also very importantly -- because DTSC requested
 2 that if we want to satisfy the request for additional
 3 information so that we can appease them in feeling
 4 comfortable with the remedy selection that we put forth to
 5 date. We feel that with this investigation, by
 6 accomplishing these objectives, we can prepare and refine
 7 the remedy selection that we made or take a closer look at
 8 some of the other ones that have been set aside as not
 9 preferred.

10 So I know it's been about a month of telling you how
 11 things are going, and I will continue to keep you updated
 12 on this project as it moves forward.

13 MR. PONTON: Regarding a list of the remedies, do
 14 you recall any other lists or any other objectives on the
 15 list of the objectives?

16 MR. NELSON: Yeah, there was. Generally for the
 17 size of Landfill E compared to the other landfills there
 18 are a great number of data gaps. If you were just to look
 19 at a map of the whole area, it's a pretty large area of the
 20 site where there's absolutely no data whatsoever. There
 21 was a desire to try and select some additional samples to
 22 try and make a determination, for instance, like we made
 23 Landfill 4 or Fill Site 1. We could refine the estimate of
 24 how much soil there is versus debris. Provided through
 25 trenching, we could do that, also putting a boring and

Page 38

1 objections to that?

2 Also related to the Feasibility Study Landfill E,
 3 which is one of the Feasibility Investigation Sites, we
 4 were requested by DTSC and the RAB about the same time the
 5 Feasibility Plan No. 4 came out last fall to take a look at
 6 Landfill E. We had a series of meetings where we came
 7 together and tried to build some objectives into this
 8 investigation, and based on that we took the documents and
 9 put them together with the scope of the work of EKI and
 10 issued it to them in December, and they turned around and
 11 submitted a proposal, which we put our collective heads
 12 together and just found out it was too costly. And if we
 13 were going into the field with this sort of proposal, it
 14 would be spending way too much money to try and meet some
 15 objectives that we had. We felt we would probably pare
 16 down this scope and still meet the objectives.

17 So the current status is that Craig and myself and
 18 Brian have been working on refining this scope of the work
 19 to reduce the costs, and we want to get out into the field
 20 this field season and accomplish these objectives. We are
 21 hoping that the field work that we were going to conduct is
 22 going to accomplish two things. First of all, it's going
 23 to satisfy the list of the objectives prepared by the
 24 stakeholders in November and December of last year, which
 25 included DTSC and the RAB and the Park Service and the

Page 40

1 looking at the bottom of the landfill, perhaps putting
 2 wells in at that interface, if it's wet, to get groundwater
 3 quality information.

4 There was some desire on the part of DTSC to look at
 5 the seismic table and techniques and also the event of the
 6 existing slope of the toe. There was some lingering
 7 questions about hydraulic and hydro. I think the RAB
 8 wanted to see a refinement of the conception site model for
 9 the site which shows a seasonal variation of the water
 10 level and whether or not it impacts the fill.

11 DTSC also wanted to know whether or not there was
 12 additional solar gas data to determine how much gas was in
 13 the landfill and what concentration of the gas was present.

14 MR. PONTON: This field season, what's that
 15 number?

16 MR. NELSON: Summer, Fall 2002.

17 MR. PONTON: This won't be part of the FS?

18 MR. NELSON: This data will not be part of it.

19 However, we anticipate that we will be able to carry the
 20 Landfill E data to this point through the FS and probably
 21 be able to amend or append some documentation on the FS to
 22 show how it affected our decision to make a remedy
 23 selection.

24 MR. SUTTER: Chris, so together with Bob and
 25 Brian, et cetera, you guys have reduced the original scope

Page 41

1 of the work of EKI while maintaining the objectives of the
2 investigation.

3 How did you do that?

4 MR. NELSON: Well --

5 MR. SUTTER: If I may ask, I want to maybe imply
6 those techniques in my own business.

7 MR. NELSON: I have to admit they've got the
8 kitchen sink for a scope, and that largely came from
9 developing a kitchen sink scope together as a group, and
10 perhaps there was a misunderstanding on their part as to
11 what they would have really accomplished through this
12 investigation versus what would be perhaps selected on
13 paper and didn't require any field work, et cetera.

14 They had estimated a long period of time in which they
15 conducted this project, say 10 months, and that means that
16 everyone -- their project management, oversight of staff,
17 et cetera, et cetera. So we are preparing those things now
18 and also the Trust and the Park Service are taking on a
19 responsibility of doing some of the work in-house that was
20 proposed by them essentially to help identify data gaps and
21 steer them in the right direction and develop a data
22 quality objective table so we clearly show this is what we
23 are trying to achieve from the objectives list. These are
24 the Field Sampling plans. Let's talk to the RAB and the
25 State to see if we are on the right track. This is what we

Page 43

1 the history with the project. They have done the detailed
2 review to date of the site data, and they have the best
3 understanding of how we are moving forward with this. I
4 think, frankly, we can cut that proposal in half by just
5 refining the scope. A more basic direction in creating
6 DOCO tables that will allow us to be focusing on
7 specifically how we are going to meet these objectives
8 through sampling and other means.

9 MR. KERN: Would you be willing to share your
10 proposal with us?

11 MR. COOPER: When it's revised.

12 MR. NELSON: When it's revised. And also getting
13 to the DOCO table, it's going to take awhile, and we can
14 work on the data gaps with the stakeholders. That was the
15 next step -- was putting the proposal in place and moving
16 forward with identifying data gaps. We could all come
17 together and say these are the data gaps and this is how we
18 intend to fill them.

19 MR. COOPER: Right. Hopefully at the March RAB
20 meeting, we can crosswalk the objectives and crosswalk with
21 a list of outlines to the EKI Proposal to show you we are
22 crosswalking and addressing each of the objectives, the
23 field investigation or paper or whatever.

24 MR. KERN: I guess I just bring that up because
25 we went through a process of developing these objectives

Page 42

1 are going to -- we are going to be objective and write to
2 the FS and get in the field.

3 MR. FORD: If you want to talk nuts and bolts,
4 which I frequently do, um, the proposal to do the workplan
5 -- to get to the stage where you had been approved, the
6 workplan for this work would be \$210,000. That's before
7 you go drill any holes or dig any pits or anything else.
8 And we looked at that and concluded that that's heading
9 towards a million-dollar investigation, and when that's
10 200,000 to get the plan on the table, you will spend a
11 million bucks by the time you drill the holes and write the
12 report. And that knocked our socks off. I mean we didn't
13 really have a set budget in mind, but you know, any kind of
14 ballpark figure that anybody was talking about was, you
15 know, maybe 2- or 300,000 to do the whole study, not
16 200,000 to do the workplan.

17 So Chris and Craig and Brian have a tall order to try
18 and squeeze that proposal down to something that we think
19 is reasonable.

20 MR. SUTTER: Sounds like a typical front-end
21 loading.

22 MR. KERN: Is EKI your only option with this to
23 do the workplan investigation?

24 MR. NELSON: No, they are not, but I think that
25 they have the best understanding of the site, and they have

Page 44

1 together. It might be nice to kind of be with you as you
2 are trying to work it out. You know, you put something out
3 and you get something back. It's way too big. And just so
4 things don't get lost -- and then we have to go back and
5 remember -- well, what was that we are trying to do.

6 MR. COOPER: We made a commitment to come back to
7 you before a final workplan.

8 MR. NELSON: And Brian actually is to credit, and
9 his remarkable memory has been shepharding that along. I
10 mean I have been too, but he has the memory of a steel
11 trap. If anything gets missed, he's going to catch it, and
12 we are going to keep moving forward with that.

13 MR. KERN: It's in the Public Record: "Brian has
14 the memory like a steel trap."

15 MR. NELSON: And I think also as a very clear
16 understanding of what the different objectives were -- for
17 some of them, they were getting them clearly on paper and
18 for some of them, we can get one boring or two trenches or
19 a well or something like that.

20 MR. KERN: Brian, are you optimistic that this
21 can be whittled down and still achieve the objectives?

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't think the answer is
23 whittling down. I think EKI proposed a method to get to
24 the steps that Chris first proposed and that we come back
25 to talk about it and basically assign a budget to do the

Page 45

1 work, and they just took the one approach. And what we
2 developed was the ultimate approach to get to probably the
3 same plan. It just won't cost as much and take as long to
4 get there, and I think that's part of the workplan, to get
5 there quickly.

6 MR. NELSON: When I say "whittling down," I mean
7 cost and not scope.

8 Any more questions? I'm taking too much time. I got
9 to get off this mike here.

10 I have one more slide: Other CERCLA Projects, Two of
11 which have not been on the agenda for a while so I'm happy
12 to say we are seeing some movement on a couple of these
13 other things. The Public Health Service Hospital. We have
14 a five-year review, the CERCLA five-year review, of the
15 Record of Decision that was done by the Army. DTSC asked
16 us to put this together last year. We put together a
17 workplan for conducting a five-year review which included a
18 Field Investigation Component, and we got comments from the
19 Park Service on that workplan, and we recently issued it to
20 them. Correct me, if I am wrong?

21 MR. KERN: Yes.

22 MR. NELSON: The response to comments on the
23 workplan. And at this time, I understand the Park Service
24 is reviewing those. They will give you their feedback and
25 whether they agree or whether they make some additional

Page 46

1 changes. But I believe if we are in agreement, we can
2 easily get this workplan out by March of this year to the
3 RAB and the agencies and that allows us to get into the
4 field in a reasonable amount of time, probably by the
5 summer, to collect the data and also begin conducting the
6 five-year review of the remedies. Those sites that are in
7 that consist of Landfill 8 and 10. We visited both of them
8 at the RAB tour a couple of weeks ago.

9 MR. COOPER: We have two big field investigations
10 planned for this summer.

11 MR. NELSON: At 10, there was no further action
12 after confirmation of sampling groundwater. At 8, it was
13 Groundwater Monitoring.

14 MR. PONTON: We feel like there's not been a very
15 clear delineation of the Landfill at 8. We are also
16 looking at some of the seismic stability issues at
17 Landfill 10. It sets up, and then there's a parking lot.
18 There appears to be some settlement from perhaps a waste
19 displacement, et cetera.

20 MR. COOPER: Does everyone know what
21 five-year reviews are? That's after ARARs has written for
22 remedies that leave wastes in place, such as the
23 Army's ROD. Basically, no further action is left. What's
24 in place is the CERCLA Program, and you have to go back
25 every five years. That's the requirement of the law. And

Page 47

1 to make sure that that remedy is still protective of human
2 health in the environment, we have to go back every
3 five years, and that's for so long. That's what we are
4 doing now, is we are going back and conducting
5 investigations to make sure that the remedy is still going
6 on. It's a no-further-action remedy. It's still
7 protective of human health.

8 MR. PONTON: Was the Landfill Remedy the asphalt
9 of the parking lot?

10 MR. NELSON: The parking lot was already there.

11 MR. PONTON: So it didn't serve as part of the
12 remedy?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: No.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Sorry to delay you on yet another
15 slide. I'm confused. I think I may just not have picked
16 up on what you said. But when you talk about, for
17 instance, groundwater monitoring only, does that mean that
18 the whole thought that we had a year or two ago of
19 reopening consideration of the remedy is now foreclosed?

20 MR. NELSON: As I just mentioned, the Army's
21 (INAUDIBLE). I wasn't saying what the Trust's new remedy
22 is or anything like that.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Then what is the workplan?

24 MR. NELSON: The workplan is to outline how we
25 are going to accomplish the five-year review and components

Page 48

1 of the five-year review to be able to field check some of
2 the information that the Army put forth in the ROD and to
3 make their decision that the ROD and the remedies were
4 protective.

5 MR. COOPER: Right.

6 MS. CHEEVER: Well, in the process you are
7 outlining here where it indicates for reconsideration,
8 what's the remedy?

9 MR. NELSON: Craig, you want to take it?

10 MR. COOPER: Well, the five-year review, there
11 will be a report, and that report will either say here's
12 everything that we looked at and here's all the data, and
13 therefore, the Army Remedy is protective of the Human
14 Health Environment Code and everything is fine; or it might
15 say, you know, after we got some concerns about the
16 protectiveness of the remedy and -- which means then we
17 have to reopen it and take a look at reopening that Remedy
18 Decision, and there's avenues in the CERCLA Process to do
19 that and to reopen it and to make the remedy protective.
20 So the five-year Review Report would be that kind of
21 document that you are looking for, that reopener to change
22 the remedy.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

24 So we are about to get the workplan to get us to that
25 report?

Page 49

1 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the key for the
3 workplan -- not only is the five-year review part of this
4 fairly large field program which reflects what we talked
5 about about 18 months ago, but the idea of identifying
6 chemicals within the waste in Landfill 8. There has been
7 no sampling of the waste, itself. We talked about trying
8 to define how much waste there is there, because it's
9 arguably very different depending on how you calculate it.
10 And then the waste involved is very different than what has
11 been presumed in the past, which it should be. Then it
12 might be appropriate to do a different remedy.

13 MR. COOPER: A thorough investigation.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

15 MR. BERMAN: To emphasize what Craig and you are
16 saying, the workplan is also looking at the
17 five-year Review Report as an opportunity to get more
18 information about the nature of the landfill itself.

19 MR. NELSON: Yes.

20 MR. BERMAN: Which was absent at the time the ROD
21 was put forth, Chris.

22 MR. COOPER: In order to make a determination is
23 this remedy protective, you know, unfortunately there's a
24 lot of data gaps in the Army's Remedy Decision Process, so
25 we are not comfortable. We are going out and collecting

Page 51

1 MR. COOPER: A thorough oversight of the Army's
2 decision, yes. Very thorough oversight.

3 MS. CHEEVER: But not with guilt because you
4 weren't there. You didn't exist.

5 MS. HARRIS: One other question: If you find
6 there are gaps in the remedy, do you have to then go back
7 to the Army to say we found this and let's negotiate again?

8 MR. NELSON: No. We have the ability to -- based
9 on what our Memorandum of the Agreement is with the Army
10 and the Park Service, we have the agreement to change the
11 remedies without doing that.

12 MS. HARRIS: Without going back again?

13 MR. NELSON: This kind of situation would not be
14 a circumstance where we would go back to the Army and say
15 we need more money. This is one of the things in the
16 Memorandum of the Agreement with the Army. This is not
17 something where -- if it costs more, it costs more. We
18 have to figure out how to save money somewhere else.

19 MS. HARRIS: Uh-huh.

20 MR. NELSON: Any other questions on that?

21 Last item: Some of you probably remember from last
22 summer we were working on a Removal Action Contingency, a
23 statewide document that dealt with digs, recovery of
24 unknown contamination, and how to notify people and clean
25 it up in an expedite fashion and move on to whatever

Page 50

1 that data and making it a more up-to-date protectiveness
2 determination. So that's why we are having more sensitive
3 field investigations than a typical five-year review.

4 MR. PONTON: That's what confuses me. I recall a
5 little bit about 18 months ago, but that's pushing it to
6 recall that far back as to what we discussed. How was it
7 initially determined that it was a remedy if the data gaps
8 existed in the remedy? Who decided to -- I guess, who
9 accepted that? Did the agencies accept that?

10 MR. COOPER: It's a rough road already.

11 MR. BOGGS: And way back when --

12 MR. PONTON: The same data gaps must have existed
13 then.

14 MR. COOPER: Right.

15 MR. PONTON: So how did they collect that data
16 then?

17 MR. NELSON: The Army had guns, I guess.

18 MR. FORD: The story I heard, the Army rammed it
19 through. I wasn't there during it. It was the very thing
20 we looked into when we were there, and they were already
21 moving -- kind of had it all tied up in a bow. We made
22 comments, but they kind of ignored them and on they went.
23 It was pretty weird actually.

24 MR. BERMAN: So you are approaching this with
25 severe guilt?

Page 52

1 project discovers the contamination. Generally projects
2 are not related to remediation trenches, operations, or
3 buildings, you know, digging up a building's foundation to
4 rebuilding a new building, something on that order.

5 Everything came to a grinding halt. The ARARs could
6 not be settled. We realized that with the entire Presidio
7 sort of in the mix on where the contingencies exist, the
8 ARARs would be required for this document, a decision
9 document. We couldn't really be able to really put forth
10 both ARARs and cleanup levels that would be acceptable,
11 because those two things were still pending, so now we are
12 getting closer to the ARARs Cleanup Level. We are going to
13 be able to get this document back on track and move it
14 forward. So we should find out next Thursday, after Brian
15 and Brian meet, how close we are to being able to move
16 forward on this, and I will keep you posted.

17 MR. KERN: Any more questions?

18 It might be appropriate to take a break for the
19 reporter, and so then we can resume with George after about
20 a ten-minute break.

21 (Whereupon break was taken at 8:35 p.m.)

22 (Whereupon meeting resumed 8:45 p.m.)

23 MR. KERN: Let's get started.

24 MR. FORD: Okay. I have twice as many slides as
25 Chris, but I hope to go through them four times as fast.

Page 53

Page 55

1 You can do the math.

2 The Groundwater Monitoring Program, the Landfill E
3 seep we sampled in late December. We told you that last
4 month -- actually, Jim Ponton has asked us to submit an
5 additional sort of follow-up sampling protocol. He would
6 like to see some more additional analysis other than the
7 one that has been done on the seep samples. We have been
8 working on a letter to propose, and that I am told will be
9 coming out of the Trust and going to the Park Service
10 tomorrow.

11 MR. PONTON: Just something really short and
12 sweet.

13 MR. FORD: We had hoped to have it to you by now.

14 MR. PONTON: Not a \$200,000.

15 MR. FORD: I'm a little disappointed that it has
16 taken just this long for our draft to get together. You
17 were clear about that, that you did not want anything
18 massive.

19 MR. PONTON: Nothing costly, no.

20 MR. FORD: But anyhow, we expect our draft will
21 go to the Park Service tomorrow, and Brian knows it's
22 coming, so the Trust and the Park Service will work
23 together and try to get it out to you as fast as we can,
24 before we get a big rain again so we have it in place when
25 the seed flows again. The Trust and the Park Service are

1 delivery problems?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Matrix-interference problems.
3 Some annihilators have very poor precision, and there's
4 two laboratories that are part of the program that
5 appear -- it's not yes or no, but it appears that there's a
6 difference in the values coming out of the two different
7 labs that's greater than you would expect.

8 MR. PONTON: For a split?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: For a split. And so those sorts
10 of things I don't feel that you can make a conclusion, and
11 yet they reported they've done some analysis that they
12 could find a problem. But I think it's worth it to talk
13 about that report so the user -- the reporter can notice
14 there's something being watched. Those data are incorrect.
15 People don't get excited about it without knowing that
16 there's a potential problem there. It's just the data
17 themselves, not what it's trying to measure. And so that's
18 part of what is now apparent that wasn't apparent the first
19 time and why this report is significantly easier than the
20 first time.

21 MR. O'HARA: Brian, what are your alternatives
22 faced with that kind of a situation? You let it go on for
23 a couple more quarters and then get new labs or what?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, I'm not quite sure. I
25 haven't spent much time to see if there's a pattern with

Page 54

Page 56

1 reviewing the internal draft of the 2001 Quarter 3 Sampling
2 Report. I haven't looked at it, but Brian tells me that
3 it's sort of a wordy, ugly-looking thing, and it's taken
4 some time for them to fix it up so it's ready to see the
5 light of day.

6 The Quarter 4 Sampling Activities happened in
7 December. Treadwell Rollo is working on the report so that
8 it will be rolled over into the Annual Summary Report. I
9 apologize I don't have a projected date for when that is
10 coming out, but I hope it will be pretty soon. And the
11 First Quarter Sampling for 2002 is scheduled to start in a
12 couple of weeks.

13 So any other questions or any questions about the
14 groundwater monitoring?

15 MR. PONTON: Are the reports getting easier?

16 MR. FORD: I was just talking about that with
17 Brian. I guess -- our thinking is that Treadwell Rollo has
18 kind of climbed up their learning curve, but Brian was just
19 saying that it's now the sort of consultant noise that some
20 glitches in the procedures are becoming evident.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's some potential
22 laboratory problems that you can't see. Maybe in another
23 quarter, I think, they should be acknowledged. They need
24 to be watched.

25 MR. PONTON: Like reporting problems or data

1 some sites or other sites or why some sites -- I think one
2 of the things may be other quarters. So that would be the
3 first thing to look at, the next quarter's data, and kind
4 of get a sense for what's going on.

5 MR. PONTON: Related to metals or things that are
6 filtered?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: What I noticed, it's metals.
8 All the metals are filtered. That wouldn't necessarily be
9 why different labs are having different apparent results.
10 It's not consistent a hundred percent of the time, which
11 makes it that much harder to figure out.

12 MR. PONTON: Instead of 35, they do all those
13 things?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's enough there. It's a
15 big program. There's enough stuff going out in the field
16 that you will have human errors in the process and filter
17 those out and make sure you don't get all excited, because
18 those things do happen in the field, and I'm not trying to
19 make comments that correct the problem right now. Just
20 make sure that the report highlights those things.
21 Potentially this helps people who are reviewing it focus in
22 on what's a problem and what may or may not be a problem or
23 a different kind of problem, and ultimately the data isn't
24 pretty good that needs to be dealt with.

25 MR. O'HARA: Do you get your money back?

Page 57

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, in some cases you do.
 2 MR. FORD: We usually don't physically get our
 3 money back. What we may get is the next analysis, which is
 4 fine as long as you still have confidence in the laboratory
 5 to, you know, do the work right, but I think, groundwater
 6 monitoring is certainly one of the constant vigilance. It
 7 is a large enough program that you will never have a
 8 quarter or a sampling event at a place like this where
 9 everything is done perfectly. There's always some noise
 10 and errors that have to be dealt with, but you have to be
 11 constantly vigilant to make sure that the noise and the
 12 errors stay down at a low level so that you can really have
 13 confidence in the bulk of the information.
 14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that's the goal for the
 15 contractors who are doing the highlights for those things.
 16 So it's not us reviewing them and saying why didn't you
 17 talk about this; it's the consultant. We found these
 18 three things we are going to watch this quarter.
 19 MR. HERMANN: Do you have models that you can
 20 apply that will say (INAUDIBLE) deal out human error by 2.5
 21 percent or whatever?
 22 MR. ULLENSVANG: There are techniques to remove
 23 up-line data, but at this point this is more just kind of
 24 judgmental than screening and looking at what may or may
 25 not be reasonable, and in some cases it is just an outlier.

Page 58

1 MR. HERMANN: There's no statistical method?
 2 MR. ULLENSVANG: In my review, I'm not doing it.
 3 I don't know if for a quarterly review Groundwater Program
 4 if that would be typically used.
 5 MR. HERMANN: But if you are collecting data over
 6 a long period of time?
 7 MR. ULLENSVANG: What's a long period?
 8 MR. HERMANN: You got enough data.
 9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Then you start working through
 10 the statistics.
 11 MR. HERMANN: You can find out.
 12 MR. ULLENSVANG: For these three months, this was
 13 unusually high, and it was done by one particular
 14 contractor. Maybe those are not representative, and then
 15 you've got a long time series. You can do that either in a
 16 rigorous statistic method or apparent process. The data is
 17 all funny and yet they go through all the reviews at the
 18 time.
 19 MR. SUTTER: These lab experiences, are they
 20 within the noise level? I mean, within low limits well
 21 below any limits that we need to worry about?
 22 MR. ULLENSVANG: Where are they?
 23 MR. SUTTER: If the error is because they are way
 24 below?
 25 MR. ULLENSVANG: They are not within the normal

Page 59

1 noise level. They are greater than you would want in your
 2 precision of the data. The difference between libraries
 3 looking at the same data point, and in some cases that
 4 different stat is also potentially high numbers, so it's
 5 not the big number difference, but we are way below a
 6 cleanup number. It is near cleanup levels and the
 7 difference between the labs in some individual instances
 8 are in order of magnitude.
 9 MR. SUTTER: So it can be a real problem?
 10 MR. ULLENSVANG: It can have an impact, and the
 11 order of magnitude between two different labs with the same
 12 sample for the same chemical, that is a greater difference
 13 than what the Trust said they wanted, and that needs to be
 14 sorted whether it makes a difference or not.
 15 MS. MONAGHAN: You are going to Landfill E with
 16 EKI. Do we get different labs for that?
 17 MR. FORD: That's a good question. We normally
 18 would require them to specify which labs they are going to
 19 use. I don't know.
 20 Chris, do you recall?
 21 MR. NELSON: They haven't got to that point where
 22 they proposed it.
 23 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's pros and cons to using
 24 different labs. You can use the same lab.
 25 MS. MONAGHAN: Is it secure?

Page 60

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: At least it's consistent.
 2 MR. NELSON: Then I think generally what we have
 3 been using -- what I found for best and for good service
 4 and price is a lab called Chromalab in Pleasanton. They
 5 are now called Severn Trent Laboratories. They were
 6 purchased by Kurtz and Thomas. I don't know what the other
 7 lab is.
 8 MR. ULLENSVANG: These sorts of things -- going
 9 back to the Groundwater Program, if you recall when we were
 10 talking about the committee meetings about starting at this
 11 program. These sorts of potential inconsistencies we're
 12 expecting whenever you make a major shift to the Army labs
 13 or to the commercial labs, those changing brands --
 14 basically you expect some transition, and it's just a
 15 matter of minimizing those.
 16 MR. NELSON: I don't think either of these labs
 17 were used by the Army. The Army's lab is out in
 18 Sacramento. They were using them fairly consistently on
 19 the Groundwater Program.
 20 MR. ULLENSVANG: They were not using these labs?
 21 MR. PONTON: I think they had a similar problem
 22 in some ways, if I recall.
 23 MR. NELSON: I think the thing that is most
 24 troubling to me in the program is that there's data
 25 validation, that it's occurring at some level after the

Page 61

1 data goes to the lab and to the consultant either -- that's
2 not catching whoever is at the end user before they report
3 it. They are not reading that or they are not seeing the
4 subjects. That's something where you are paying that money
5 for data validation.

6 MR. PONTON: It should be flagged.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: It needs to be flagged so that
8 the cache reader doesn't trip over the data.

9 MR. NELSON: Right.

10 MR. KERN: Sounds like we are done on that topic.

11 MR. NELSON: Four times faster. Come on, George.

12 MR. FORD: The next topic is LAIR. The
13 demolition is about 75 percent done. The building is down.
14 Most of the foundation walls are gone. There are a few
15 corners left, and there are about a quarter of the floor
16 slabs left. One of the things that we have discovered in
17 looking at the actual building as opposed to looking at the
18 plans is that in researching this project initially, we
19 thought the sanitary sewers were beneath the basement floor
20 slab. There isn't. All the sanitary sewers exist through
21 the side basement wall about eight feet above the floor
22 level. There are feeder sewers outside the building, but
23 there are no actual sanitary sewers beneath the floor
24 slabs.

25 One of the things that discovery has caused is that we

Page 63

1 chemical warfare agents. So I'm happy to say that so far
2 environmentally it's been a fairly boring site which is, I
3 think, ultimately what we were all hoping for.

4 We're in a little bit -- there's a flurry of activity
5 at the beginning of the basement level. It was reached by
6 the demolition crew. Things have kind of slowed down again
7 for a while, and we expect another flurry of activity in
8 late March to mid-April, which is the time when the
9 contractor is scheduled to chase out these feeder sewer
10 lines that are outside the building and also to trench out
11 the main trunk sewers that all the feeders connect to. We
12 kind of have a more limited presence at the site right now,
13 but once we begin digging out those sewers, we will be back
14 in there.

15 MR. O'HARA: George, on the last item, that last
16 bullet point there on the main trunk sewers to be removed
17 in late March to mid-April, is that the main sewers and the
18 feeder sewers, or are you going to remove the main sewers
19 first and then the feeder sewers? And if so, why would you
20 work upstream as opposed to coming downstream?

21 MR. FORD: I think they are going to work from
22 the feeder sewers towards the trunks, so they will
23 basically be going --

24 MR. O'HARA: Downstream.

25 MR. FORD: -- from upstream towards downstream.

Page 62

1 got a -- proposed some changes to the Sanitary Sewer
2 Sampling Plant that we had proposed to DTSC. The big chunk
3 of that plan was to observe the removal of the sewers below
4 the slab and sampling along them as they were taken out,
5 since they are not there. We can't do that, and we want to
6 focus or shift our focus to areas where there might be, you
7 know, the feeder sewers outside the building.

8 So we are in the process of putting together a
9 proposal to review the Sampling Plan to DTSC. We discussed
10 it with Bob, and I think, sort of -- get the impression
11 that he's on board with the idea, but we got to get it in
12 writing and get it in front of him so he can take a look at
13 it and decide whether he's on board or not.

14 We have found four areas where the soil was either
15 affected by something or we thought it might be. Three of
16 these have turned out to be low levels of petroleum that
17 occurred mostly around the perimeter of the building, two
18 of them in backfill soil and was placed against the
19 building after it was constructed, and one we think was a
20 spill associated with a tank that the Army had removed some
21 time ago, and they just didn't clean it all up. We have
22 one feeder sewer from the administrative wing. It has been
23 exposed and sampled so far, and those results are coming
24 back to us, and we haven't had any visual indications or
25 additional laboratory indications or any biological or

Page 64

1 I have to confirm that, because one of the things we are
2 learning is that the demolition contractor doesn't
3 precisely schedule a whole week's worth of the work. He
4 kind of ends up with an idea of what he thinks he is going
5 to do during the week, but then he moves people and
6 equipment around kind of just in response to -- I don't
7 know -- phases of the moon or whatever. During the week he
8 moves people around quite a bit, so we have to stay very
9 close to him to make sure that he doesn't start working in
10 some area that we don't know about. So I've got to confirm
11 that. I believe the plan is that they will work from the
12 basement walls outward, so they will be chasing the feeder
13 sewers out towards the trunks and then moving along the
14 trunks, you know, basically towards -- the trunk areas all
15 pretty much head from south to north. They drain down to
16 the north and go forward.

17 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

18 MR. FORD: Sure.

19 MR. SUTTER: I'm just curious. How is it
20 determined initially over the information that leads you
21 to, I believe, that the sanitary sewers were under the
22 basement floor slab? Was it per as-build of the lab
23 facility?

24 MR. FORD: Yeah. It was a combination of some
25 confusing as-builds and also some miscommunication within

Page 65

1 the Trust. For quite a while, I didn't look at the
2 as-builds myself. We had the people who are in the LAIR
3 project office -- they were looking at it and kind of
4 xeroxing little squares out and sending them to me and
5 explaining to me what they thought existed there. And I
6 think I may not have been completely clear in what I wanted
7 to focus on. But I also -- I did look at the full-size
8 drawings that -- I was quite sure of having looked at them
9 and that there were sanitary feeder sewers beneath the
10 basement floor slab, and so I was actually kind of
11 surprised that after they did the demolition, they knocked
12 the building down and filled up the basement with building
13 rubble. We couldn't see anything. Then after they took
14 all the rubble out and the ground up to the aggregate, then
15 you could see some of these sewer pipes that were existing
16 in the basement wall. And that's when, you know -- just
17 one of those cases where you think you understand from
18 looking at the plans, but it becomes crystal clear once you
19 look at it out at the job site.

20 MR. SUTTER: Probably some incorporated into the
21 asphalt?

22 MR. FORD: There may be. Generally speaking, the
23 Army's as-builds are not necessarily as builds. Sometimes
24 I think they do take the design drawings and stamp them as
25 as builds and put them in the file.

Page 66

1 MR. SUTTER: Right.

2 MR. FORD: Fortunately, the way this is
3 processed, we were able to see what the real situation was
4 before they started removing any sewers or exposing
5 anything. This is a picture of what the site looked like
6 roughly ten days ago, and you can see there is nothing
7 left, except there is a few little corners here and there.
8 I'm not even sure why the contractor is leaving those up.
9 There's a lot of machinery moving around in there and a lot
10 of things happening.

11 MR. PONTON: Is that 3 arbitration?

12 MR. FORD: It's 23 arbitration.

13 MR. PONTON: Wow.

14 MR. FORD: And this is one of the sites -- not a
15 very good photograph -- one of the places where we found
16 contaminates in the backfield. And in this case, it
17 happened to be gasoline. It was right near the former
18 front door. This is a picture that is taken pretty much if
19 you were standing like inside the old front door at LAIR
20 looking out to the northwest. You know, LAIR sort of is an
21 L-shaped building and the front door -- the main entrance
22 was sort of the internal angle of the L. This is what it
23 looks like under the steps of the -- maybe I'll try to use
24 my laser pointer.

25 This was the ground surface right here. These two

Page 67

1 things are grave beams that were supporting the deck out in
2 front of the front door, and where they found some gasoline
3 contamination in the soil is down here and over here, which
4 are basically backfill soils that were placed against the
5 outside of the building after it was constructed.

6 So we think they just used bad fill. I mean, in this
7 case, it wasn't something that was spilled outside. It was
8 just the fill they brought to pack in around the building
9 was contaminated. It was a small amount where the
10 contractor dug it out and put it in a separate pile for us,
11 and we have since taken some samples, closure-type samples,
12 to document that the soil that is left there is clean. And
13 we hope we have taken care of that one.

14 Next slide, please. This is a site -- I've talked
15 about a tank that the Army may have removed where they
16 didn't get it all. We think a tank used to be kind of
17 right in this location. This used to be a concrete wall.
18 This is actually the north wall of LAIR which faces Gorgas
19 Street. We think there may have been a tank outside the
20 wall. The Army removed it some time ago. They cleaned out
21 most of the tank excavation. There was some dark stuff
22 down here at the bottom, and we did a couple of rounds of
23 digging there and took all that stuff out and segregated it
24 in different piles. It turns out that soil had some diesel
25 fuel in it. We've done closure sampling to document that

Page 68

1 we got it all.

2 I think if you go to the next slide -- I thought I had
3 a slide in there that showed our stock piles. Right now
4 there's roughly a hundred cubic yards of soil in a couple
5 different stockpiles under plastic and on pavement, and we
6 are getting ready to dispose of that. It contains little
7 bits of the gasoline and some diesel. We are planning to
8 get rid of that off-site, but so far we haven't found
9 anything that's biological or chemical warfare stuff that
10 we regard as highly interesting. So we will try to keep
11 you posted.

12 Mountain Lake. The DTSC is in the process of making a
13 second request to Caltrans.

14 MR. BOGGS: It's in our legal department. I
15 haven't been knocking on their door, because they usually
16 hand me more work than I do. But I will follow up on that.

17 MR. FORD: Okay. Well, the hope is that if DTSC
18 asks Caltrans again, the second time will be a charm, and
19 they will agree to come to the table and discuss the issues
20 at Mountain Lake. If they don't respond to the second
21 request, then I guess DTSC will have to kind of decide how
22 hard they want to push them and what else they will be able
23 to do.

24 MR. BOGGS: The second request is considerably a
25 harder push; not a threat, but an indication what our next

Page 69

1 step will be if they don't respond.

2 MS. YAROS: What is that?

3 MR. BOGGS: It's something called a GAR, which is
4 a Governor's Action Request. And basically they don't like
5 one state agency taking another state agency to court, so
6 they actually go up to the governor's office, and the
7 governor makes a request to the water board to participate.

8 MR. PONTON: To Caltrans?

9 MR. BOGGS: Right. Oh, sorry. Yes, Caltrans.

10 MR. FORD: We are hoping that Caltrans will do
11 the right thing. The next request.

12 MR. PONTON: Could we also write an order that
13 names Caltrans to cleanup?

14 MR. BOGGS: Well, that you would probably have to
15 go to the Board, because you are probably going to have
16 similar considerations of one state agency to another. Our
17 next letter modeled after what we call a VCA, Voluntary
18 Cleanup Agreement, it parallels the Board's order. We try
19 to get them to cooperate rather than make an order. So
20 that may be another method to get them to participate as
21 well. I'm not sure, but I will bring that up with Isabella
22 when I talk to her -- that's our attorney -- if she thinks
23 that would have any additional effect or not.

24 MR. PONTON: It wouldn't have to go to the
25 governor.

Page 71

1 sand filters so that -- particularly for a direct
2 discharge, things like that. That's on our Web site.
3 Caltrans' permit's on our general Web site.

4 MR. KERN: Is there anything directly addressed
5 for the roadway?

6 MR. PONTON: I talked to Jennifer Coats the other
7 day. I scanned it before talking to her to let her know it
8 was there, and I didn't see -- I wanted to see if they had
9 a direct line to a lake --

10 MR. KERN: Right.

11 MR. PONTON: -- or into a national park lake to
12 see what happens, but I didn't see it. It was more having
13 to do with controls for new construction and work that they
14 are currently working on. I know we are working on doing
15 the bridge spans because there will be water runoff when it
16 rains, and that needs to be handled with discharged --
17 treated and then discharged, rather. But no, I didn't -- I
18 didn't look at that detail. But I think you are right,
19 Bob. It's going to be pressing.

20 MR. BOGGS: Right. Lawyers are involved.

21 MR. PONTON: I just think it's a poor design for
22 this specific site.

23 MR. BOGGS: Oh, yeah.

24 MR. PONTON: It's not a seasonal area along the
25 side. It's a retention basin. It's a lake.

Page 70

1 MR. BOGGS: They may just do the same thing and
2 not respond.

3 MR. FORD: Getting Caltrans to pay thanks to this
4 seems like trying to get the attention of an elephant by
5 poking it with your index finger. There's a pretty thick
6 skin. You've got to make a pretty big noise to get them to
7 acknowledge that you're there at all.

8 MR. BOGGS: Unfortunately, there's some pretty
9 big issues for them in responding.

10 MR. NELSON: Precedence-setting things.

11 MR. BOGGS: Every ditch in the state along every
12 highway has been Caltrans' liability. So there's hopefully
13 ways they can be persuaded to participate without accepting
14 liability for every ditch in the state.

15 MR. PONTON: We have a general order just for
16 Caltrans, but I don't think it necessarily handles that --
17 every ditch and stuff, but they have to comply with certain
18 requirements for water discharges, and they have their own
19 -- like industrial permit solvent sites and the gas station
20 Petroleum Cleanup.

21 MR. BOGGS: With us, too.

22 MR. FORD: Do those apply statewide?

23 MR. PONTON: It depends on what region you are in
24 what they are required to do. Retention basins are a big
25 thing now, stream water runoffs or drop basins that contain

Page 72

1 MR. BOGGS: Yeah.

2 MR. PONTON: So there might be something that we
3 can do as a responsible party to put the law in order.

4 MR. BOGGS: Yeah.

5 MR. O'HARA: Real good tag team.

6 MR. KERN: One sentence on a slide, George. That
7 was pretty good. Go ahead.

8 MR. FORD: So we may be seeing some pressure
9 coming onto Caltrans.

10 Petroleum stuff. The Building 1065 CAP Workplan. We
11 just had Jim's comments, and Bob's comments are coming
12 along shortly. When we get those, we will look at them and
13 incorporate them and do revised drafts. So we will be
14 working on that later this month and into March.

15 207-231 CAP. Harding is working for us preparing a
16 data-gap workplan for that site. And I believe a draft of
17 that is due to us early in March. And so a public copy
18 would be coming out probably in late March. And then we
19 have a draft workplan for the Commissary-PX CAP. This is
20 big stuff. We did a small cleanup in the corner right next
21 to the marsh. This is an expansion of that and looking at
22 the whole Commissary-PX Parcel. That workplan is now
23 being revised. Brian looked at it. We looked at it. It
24 needs some work, so we sent it back to Treadwell Rollo, who
25 is working on that. They are fixing it up now, and we

Page 73

1 should have the revised plan back within a couple of weeks
2 and then we hope we can then circulate that to everybody.
3 So that's another thing that will be coming up on your
4 radar screen pretty soon.

5 MR. PONTON: How are the seeps doing now?

6 MR. FORD: Actually, I've got to look at the
7 data. I think we are overdue for sampling. But as I
8 recall, the last data I saw, they were sort of slowly
9 treading downward, but, you know, we had some seasonal
10 variations before we got to select another round and see
11 whether they, you know -- the downward trends were
12 persisting. I know one of the other things, I guess -- in
13 Quarter 3, we had the first sampling up. There are
14 three monitoring levels down there in the cleanup area, and
15 a number of those look good. I don't recall, but they
16 are -- I believe they are below the marsh.

17 MR. PONTON: Slow potential numbers?

18 MR. FORD: Yeah. So that's another thing we want
19 to take a look at. But we do have to get back out there
20 and take some seep samples, so we will do that and send in
21 the results.

22 We are also starting the Building 1349 CAP. 1349 was
23 not a building. It was a hundred-thousand-gallon heating
24 storage tank up on Robert Hall, across the street from the
25 World War II Sailors' Memorial. We looked at that site

Page 74

1 now, and Treadwell Rollo, they have recommended that we
2 draw in a fuel-distribution system and issue a line where
3 the Army didn't completely finish a cleanup that goes by
4 there.

5 So we are trying to do things differently than the
6 Army did. They have like a tank-removal operation and then
7 a fuel-distribution-removal operation then, you know,
8 metals-cleanup operation. What we are trying to do is look
9 at the whole site, draw a circle around it, and fix every
10 problem that falls within two circles. So we will be
11 adding some fuel-distribution-system sites that are right
12 adjacent to 1349. We will have a draft of that out within
13 the next couple of months.

14 That's one -- kind of going slowly, where, you know,
15 it's way out of schedule. We are just trying to make some
16 progress on it early.

17 MR. O'HARA: George, I remember several years ago
18 some sampling that had been done, and there was a plume, as
19 I recall -- Brian, you are the memory man here -- that was
20 underneath the road.

21 Was that every cleaned?

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: In '96 -- I think it was maybe
23 early '97, they did a removal. They removed the tank, if
24 you recall.

25 MR. O'HARA: Oh, yeah, I remember.

Page 75

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: They took out the tank and dug
2 out a lot of soil from underneath the tank. After that the
3 tank was used for the reservoir of the fuel; oil was
4 converted to be used for diesel oil; diesel was off-loaded
5 onto the street right where Fill Site 5 is.

6 MR. FORD: Washington Boulevard.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: They dribbled a bit by filling
8 trucks there and created some diesel contamination which
9 did extend underneath Washington Boulevard that was dug out
10 to a certain degree. And so one of the things that CAP
11 will look at is, did they get enough and what else is
12 there, and if there's still some evidence of contamination
13 in the water. And so they're taking a holistic approach to
14 see what still needs to be done.

15 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: If you go up there, you can see
17 where the road asphalt had seamed, where they took out the
18 amount of asphalt -- about how much they removed.

19 MR. O'HARA: I recall them talking about doing
20 it, but I didn't recall whether they actually did.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: They actually did it.

22 MR. FORD: Our hope -- or kind of our operating
23 hypothesis is that the Army did sort of 80 or 85 percent of
24 what needed to be done. The heavy lifting is already taken
25 care of, and, you know, what this CAP will be doing is sort

Page 76

1 of trying to finish off the last 15 percent to really get
2 it all the way done. We are hoping it turns out that way
3 once we delve into it. We may find something different.
4 We will let you know.

5 The East Housing mini-CAP Reports are due to come to
6 the Trust next week. We will look at them and pass them
7 along to the Park Service, and then when the Trust and the
8 Park Service agree we'll be sending them out to everybody
9 else, mainly to Jim, so he can review them.

10 We have in hand the tank removal reports. We took out
11 the Dust Bowl a couple of months ago and also Building 34.
12 We are looking at those. After we get Brian's concurrence,
13 we will circulate them.

14 And the mini-CAP, the draft workplan for the sites,
15 along with the main para-ground and Building 951, which is
16 up -- it's kind of the big bachelor's officer quarters that
17 is at the north end of Files Road. Jim has that and is
18 reviewing it.

19 MR. PONTON: I will do that this week.

20 MR. FORD: That's one of those ones that we
21 could -- kind of like to get, but it isn't a huge
22 front burner for us at the moment.

23 We are also in the process of doing a census of the
24 Coastal Battery Tanks. We had some news that it isn't
25 Coastal Battery. We confirmed there are two tanks at

Page 77

1 Building 1450 and 1451. These are yet another site that,
2 you know, there are event pipes and filters. You just have
3 to go kick the leaves away and there they are, yet the Army
4 has no record of them. We are going to finish our research
5 and figure out what they had there, and we will take them
6 out and report on that.

7 MR. HARRIS: Is that -- Building 34, is that the
8 library?

9 MR. FORD: That's actually the Trust Main
10 Headquarters Building, and they found -- they are doing
11 some landscaping. They were putting in irrigation pipes
12 for the -- to rehabilitate the grass. I think the trencher
13 hit the tank and hit the film deck, too. That was another
14 tank that the Army had no record of.

15 MS. HARRIS: Oh.

16 MR. FORD: I would say that it's kind of a
17 noise-level issue. We find about, on average, maybe one
18 tank a month for which the Army had no records, and usually
19 we find them in the content of when we are doing something
20 else at the building. And so, you know, we have to jump on
21 it right away; otherwise, if we don't get the tank out,
22 then we will delay whatever work is scheduled at the
23 building.

24 MR. NELSON: I wanted to add kudos to the Park
25 Service. I know we were talking about the historic --

Page 78

1 historic preservation. There's a gentleman, Jim Crem, I
2 think he is a historian. He pointed out there was an Army
3 drawing indicating the possibility of a tank at the site,
4 even though the Army's records were not completed, you
5 know, going through the process of determining whether or
6 not it's a historic issue. If you are going to go digging
7 in coastal waters, sometimes things come back that are
8 worthwhile.

9 MR. FORD: So all those bads things that I said
10 about the Park Service --

11 MR. NELSON: We can still joke about it. It's
12 actually a good thing.

13 MR. FORD: It was kind of a nice tip to find that
14 these things were there. We would rather not discover new
15 tanks, but as long as they're there, I guess we need to
16 know about them.

17 Next slide, please. The Skeet Range. We are
18 corresponding with Bob, trying to work out the final
19 details of what we need to do out at the field. We got the
20 contracting wheels going, and Albert Chan is putting out a
21 bit of solicitation, which may have gone out already. We
22 hope to do the field work in late March or April. So that
23 project keeps sliding back in the schedule, but we finally
24 are rested. The schedule slide -- and we know when it's
25 going to be done.

Page 79

1 MR. O'HARA: You say the "field work." Is that
2 testing?

3 MR. FORD: No. That's digging the hole, getting
4 the bad dirt out and sending it off to Livermore or
5 wherever it's going to go.

6 MR. O'HARA: Get the bad dirt out and get the
7 water in?

8 MR. FORD: And we hope that will be -- once we do
9 that and do our closure sampling and write the report, we
10 hope to be forever finished with the Skeet Range.

11 MR. PONTON: George, remember that 401? Is that
12 expired?

13 MR. FORD: I bet it has, which is one of the
14 other things that -- I've got to take a look at and find
15 out what the duration is on that, and we also have -- we've
16 got it from you and I think BCDC. I've got to check on the
17 status on those, either renew them or apply. We will be
18 doing that.

19 Crissy Field Closure Sampling. Bob asked for
20 additional information on the work. The Trust was
21 proposing to do around Building 937. We are working on a
22 letter to give to them with the information. I hope that
23 letter will come out within the next week or ten days. And
24 then if we all get on the same page, we will be able to finish
25 up down there.

Page 80

1 And that's it. There's no more slides. Thank you
2 very much. Good night.

3 Next slide. Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. That one has
4 been in a holding pattern, as you know, primarily because
5 the Trust and the Park Service had been going back and
6 forth on the ARARs.

7 A week ago, I was angry about the whole situation. I
8 think this week we sort of -- at least I'm cautiously
9 optimistic that we are going -- getting towards the end of
10 the ARARs negotiating. I'm hoping that may have a domino
11 effect. Once we can get the ARARs done, then the rest of
12 them from this project will fall quickly, and then we can
13 get the RAB out as an official draft and go through the
14 public comment period, and have the public meeting, do our
15 response to comments, get it approved by RAB, and I'll go
16 dig the holes. The Trust, you know, realizes that
17 everybody is anxious to do this. We are looking at the
18 schedule and trying to figure out how much we can compress
19 it. Once the ARARs are agreed to it -- and I can't tell
20 you, you know, what a possible dig date is, you know,
21 assuming all the dominos fall right now, but I can tell you
22 that we will be pushing on it as hard as we can.

23 MR. SUTTER: What about the operational
24 (INAUDIBLE)?

25 MR. FORD: No, I don't think so. I mean it is --

Page 81

1 we haven't agreed with the Park Service yet. So, you know,
2 I don't want to, you know -- nothing will move until we do,
3 but I hope. I think we are getting pretty close and that,
4 you know, for a long time we were not very close. On the
5 ARARs issue, we are just seeing -- it's going to take
6 another week or ten days.

7 MR. KERN: You think you could actually describe
8 where it's about at this point? What's at stake? What's
9 the important issues?

10 MR. FORD: The ARARs have come down to -- there's
11 our suit of ARARs that the Trust and the Park Service are
12 at early on -- agree to apply to the sites. But most
13 recently, the debate has centered around the issue of
14 whether the Area A Memorandum of Agreement, which is
15 between the Trust and the Park Service and the GMPA, would
16 be listed as ARARs. And I can certainly give you
17 background. I think the difficulty with the Trust and the
18 Park Service have been having in my view, and you will get
19 it in a few minutes.

20 The Trust and NPS sort of approach the listing of the
21 development of the ARARs' list from different ends of the
22 spectrum. The Trusts' council has sort of a reductionist
23 viewpoint, and they look at it and say okay, if we know
24 that a regulation specifically applies to something that we
25 know exists at the site, we will list it as ARARs,

Page 82

1 but -- otherwise, you don't go back about a hypothetical.
2 If you know it is something that specifically applies at
3 the site and would affect the remedy, we don't list it as
4 ARARs. So the Trust is coming from the prospective that
5 nothing gets to be in ARARs unless it can be shown to be
6 specifically relevant to the remedy that we are doing at
7 the site. And we feel -- and, you know, Brian definitely
8 gets a chance to disagree, but sort of our view -- and the
9 Park Service has a bit more of a global view -- of ARARs is
10 that there are a fairly large sweep of laws and regulations
11 that do apply, and very well might apply some reasonable
12 scenario that would cause the laws to be drawn in and
13 become relevant. And so they want to see more things
14 listed. Typically, they want to see more things listed,
15 ARARs and the Trust does. And, you know, ARARs from the
16 two different philosophies, it's been pretty hard for the
17 two organizations to get together. So that's the Trust's
18 story in a nutshell.

19 Brian.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes.

21 MR. FORD: Okay. You know there's history there.
22 We try to be careful not to misrepresent each other's
23 positions.

24 MR. O'HARA: When all of this shakes out, will
25 option A or option B or a combination of both philosophies

Page 83

1 have any effect whatsoever on the remedy or the work that
2 will be done?

3 MR. FORD: I think I've got to give you
4 two answers. The short answer is no. I mean, in terms of
5 how we are going to dig the hole, what shape is the hole
6 going to be, what are we going to do with the dirt, none of
7 that will change. There are -- some of the ARARs could
8 affect small bodies of water and things like medical waste
9 if you discover it. We don't anticipate any regulated
10 medical waste in either Landfill 4 or Fill Site 5. But if
11 we find some there as a whole sweep of regulations having
12 to do with medical waste, then we will have to adhere to
13 whether they're ARARs listed or not. So some of the
14 details could potentially be affected.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: And I think that's part of where
16 our agencies' differences fit in as to the impact. And
17 that ARARs went out however many months ago we have done
18 (INAUDIBLE) subject to what kind of difference it makes.
19 We weren't sure it would make a difference, the
20 disagreements we had, and so we concurred on subjects to
21 see what distinctions, you know -- once we actually saw how
22 they were proposed, a specific type, then we could evaluate
23 if it did make a difference or not. And so we weren't
24 sure. It depends on how the Trust goes about -- and scopes
25 the project and what is found within those new answers.

Page 84

1 The area in a way -- what current subjects of the
2 disagreement we believe that provides a framework and
3 requirements for regulations and criteria for cleanup.
4 The Trust feels less subject to that extent, and so it
5 may or may not make a difference, and that's what we are
6 trying to sort out. We are less in need of including it.
7 If it will make a difference at the same regard and the
8 Trust is saying you are going to follow the A way so our
9 position in some regards if they are going to follow up is,
10 why not. And we are not sure. I don't think anyone is
11 exactly sure.

12 MR. O'HARA: With all due respect to your
13 respective opinions and philosophies, this could go on
14 forever.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: We are not willing to let it go
16 on forever. That's why it's being elevated within both our
17 agencies to sort it out. It can't go on forever. It needs
18 to move on.

19 MR. O'HARA: I understand, but I think what
20 concerns the members of this organization as
21 representatives of the public and sort of the public's
22 oversight of what's going on is the sparring of attorneys
23 for indefinite periods of time. And again, I think that
24 both you and George have said that you see the light at the
25 end of the tunnel which is certainly goodness. But to the

Page 85

1 extent that your respective counsel can't get together and
2 get the matter resolved at some point, you got to say
3 enough already, and it's got to go to arbitration of some
4 sort.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Two things: One is I think that
6 the actual amount of time the attorneys have spent sparring
7 is little compared to the amount of time elapsed, so it may
8 over there have not been weekly meetings of arguments about
9 the issue. And then within that framework, we have to have
10 agreements that we could resolve disputes if we were
11 between our agencies. There is a mechanism to get to an
12 authority that would determine the outcome of the
13 arguments. It's a fairly lengthy process.

14 Neither agency wants to get to that point, so there's
15 motivation because the disagreement process is so miserable
16 -- motivation to make the agreement before you get there.
17 And we are at that point, and our respective Park
18 Superintendent and the acting Executive Director of the
19 Trust will work it out and come to some sort of agreement
20 soon. I'm quite confident that that will happen and that
21 will happen fairly soon.

22 MR. O'HARA: Fairly soon?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe the Trust Director has
24 been briefed on the subject. My superintendent meets next
25 week. I would guess that it will happen within their

Page 87

1 "cool," given his concerns on the issue months ago when he
2 talked about these issues.

3 MR. SUTTER: I had a question which was taking
4 off of what Peter said. Is this class civilization going
5 to happen at every site, or once you kind of come to a
6 meeting ground at this point on ARARs 4 and 5, will you
7 have achieved an overall resolution as to how to deal with
8 ARARs or other sites?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: This actually started within
10 most of the subjects, and so the general understanding with
11 a few exceptions -- there was a document that went out to
12 the agencies and the public, and so now this is just the
13 refinement for these particular sites. There may be
14 individual other sites that raise issues that are not
15 addressed by the sites and we have a conflict, but the bulk
16 has been done to make a selection, and I think that this is
17 not something that at least our agency is wanting to do
18 again. This is not a good situation. And I think we will
19 try to avoid that, and I think we are well ahead of the
20 curve on the other upcoming decisions which involve ARARs.

21 MR. FORD: There should be -- this agreement, it
22 should have multiple payoffs.

23 MR. HULTGREN: Would it be any help in expediting
24 this, if the body sent a letter to your two superiors and
25 just indicated that we were concerned? And we would

Page 86

1 schedules. They are busy individuals, but within days or
2 weeks following that, they can talk about the issue and
3 resolve it.

4 MR. O'HARA: Okay. I think that as the Advisory
5 Board we would really like to see this matter concluded by
6 this time next month.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Uh-huh.

8 MR. O'HARA: I think it's reasonable if you folks
9 can't get to an understanding or an agreement -- and I'm
10 assuming what you are talking about -- the next step is
11 arbitration, and neither party wants to go there.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's short of the arbitration.
13 The next step -- there is a formal step called Onset of
14 Clauses, which each side has specific periods of time. The
15 project managers get together, and it goes to more senior
16 decision makers, and it moves up -- I believe, it goes to
17 the Attorney General's office for resolution.

18 MR. O'HARA: You don't want to go there.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: We don't want to go there.

20 MR. O'HARA: Hopefully we'll have the resolution
21 on the table this time next month?

22 MR. NELSON: Could Brian O'Neil just say "cool"
23 with what you are proposing? Does he have to take it to
24 Craig?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't expect him to say

Page 88

1 certainly like to have some resolution of it within the
2 next month.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: You are welcome to do that. I
4 don't believe that's the issue. The conflict has been
5 elevated. Frankly, we weren't aware of the longer head
6 until two weeks ago. So it's not that this has been
7 brewing for months. We were making back-and-forth progress
8 and got to the end of that progress and now moved to the
9 decision maker.

10 MR. HULTGREN: You think it's going to move then
11 reasonably fast whether we say something or not?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe so, and I think
13 Peter's time frame is not out of line.

14 MR. FORD: Well, I think we're close. Like I
15 said last week, I didn't think it was going to move, but
16 this week they do seem to be moving, and I would really
17 like to get past the ARARs and get some heavy equipment out
18 to 4 and 5 and move some dirt. So I do think we are just
19 about at the end of the process. I would say that if the
20 RAB wants to send the letter or do a resolution, that sure
21 wouldn't hurt.

22 MS. WRIGHT: We can't get you to guess a
23 projected start date, if everything goes the way you hope
24 it would and things progress and move along? Is there a
25 possibility?

Page 89

1 MR. FORD: I hate to guess on this one. It has
2 slid so much. I would rather take a closer look at the
3 schedule and get back to you.
4 MS. WRIGHT: Okay.
5 MR. FORD: Right now I do know if we look at sort
6 of the normal schedule, not trying to compress anything, I
7 don't think digging happens until about August or
8 September.

9 Does that sound about right?

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Sounds about right.

11 MR. FORD: It's my hope that if we can get this
12 ARARs thing buttoned up, we are going to be looking for
13 what can we do to compress the schedule. I don't know what
14 this dig start date would be, but I can look at it and try
15 to figure that out and get back to you.

16 MS. WRIGHT: You can even call it a goal.

17 MR. FORD: Okay. That would probably be good,
18 because we still have some steps in the process that we got
19 to work through even after the ARARs.

20 MS. WRIGHT: Sure, I understand.

21 MR. FORD: Let me look at that, and I'll e-mail
22 something out.

23 MS. WRIGHT: Or we can talk about it at the
24 committee meeting?

25 MR. KERN: Sam.

Page 91

1 threatening.

2 MR. BERMAN: Yes, it is. It's not in the ARARs
3 package. It would just deal with the revised CAP of some
4 kind.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, if it was a small amount
6 and because Crissy Field -- it's possible it would be a
7 seep engineer that would want to disarm that find. You
8 don't know whether it is that or not. They didn't go off
9 and set it aside. There would be a proposal of how to deal
10 with that.

11 MR. BERMAN: It's not an ARARs problem.

12 MR. FORD: You raise a good point. I have to
13 look at the workplan and we should have the workplan -- if
14 doesn't contain it, we will add in a section that says if
15 we see anything that looks like -- are exposed ordinance
16 here -- it's the unexposed ordinance protocol.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you have it in there,
18 because there's a number of unlikely occurrences that might
19 happen, but we still need to work forward. But I think
20 human remains found -- if there is medical waste, if
21 there's unexposed ordinance, if there's liquid waste found.
22 These are nothing that are expected to be found, but you
23 want to make sure you are prepared for something that is an
24 unexpected discovery.

25 MR. BERMAN: So the real substantive issue is

Page 90

1 MR. BERMAN: You mentioned the possibility of the
2 medical waste. Of course, so far it has not been found at
3 either 4 or 5, but right next to 4 is the old (INAUDIBLE)
4 storage and there's always sort of in the back of my mind a
5 worry that when you actually started to dig that you would
6 find some residue connected with the storage facility
7 there.

8 Is that, in any way, involved in the ARARs issue that
9 you mentioned, George?

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: They are not ARARs. They were
11 potential ordinances found in those -- and will be put
12 forth in the Contingency Plan, but functional procedures at
13 Crissy Field would work. That's what the Trust has been
14 doing to the explicit plan. ARARs, to my recollection, I
15 don't really think hinges either way on the potential finds
16 that are specific. ARARs talked about that.

17 MR. BERMAN: So it's not the medical waste?

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's not. A medical waste is
19 unique. It's a potential error. There are PCP within an
20 analysis that go to waste. It's not known in those sites,
21 but there are specific regulations if they were to be found
22 there.

23 MR. BERMAN: But to me, I mean, exposed ordinance
24 is just as much of a concern as a small amount of PCP.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's even much more life

Page 92

1 surrounding medical waste.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Medical waste --

3 MR. FORD: That's one that we're actually working
4 through.

5 MR. BERMAN: Okay. So I meant to emphasize
6 basically what Peter was saying -- was that somehow this is
7 at a level over and-above all the technical solutions and
8 exigencies that might occur. This is something -- and if I
9 may use the Supreme Court term "in the pendulum of the
10 negotiations."

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: That may be where we are looking
12 at these issues. They probably will not have a significant
13 impact on how George turns the shovel.

14 MR. KERN: So you are anticipating talking to
15 your people a week from this Thursday?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes, which is the next available
17 time.

18 MR. KERN: So we are going to have a meeting two
19 weeks from tonight.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: We can certainly have something
21 for you at that time.

22 MR. KERN: So depending on your response or your
23 report, we can then be prepared to do something. Like if
24 it's all blown up and nothing is going to happen, we can do
25 something?

Page 93

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's highly unlikely
 2 that the following Thursday it will blow up and nothing
 3 will happen. I think that's a very unusual scenario, and
 4 knowing our park superintendent, I think that's not the
 5 type of path that he will choose to follow.
 6 MR. NELSON: So if you show up at the meeting and
 7 there's large quantities of booze flowing, you will know
 8 what happened.
 9 MR. BERMAN: Or if the door is locked.
 10 MR. KERN: Perhaps we can begin to get something
 11 for the meeting just in case, anticipating the worst case
 12 scenario.
 13 MR. FORD: If the negotiation breaks down, I'm
 14 not coming to the committee meeting.
 15 MR. KERN: If no one is there, you know what
 16 happened. Thanks for talking about this.
 17 Any other comments or questions at this point? Thanks
 18 a lot for talking, George. Thank you very much. We are on
 19 to the closing down of the meeting here. Let's go to
 20 Item No. 6, Bob and Jim.
 21 MR. BOGGS: Any questions?
 22 MR. PONTON: One thing that George didn't mention
 23 is that if anyone at Larson or anyone that was provided
 24 with water tanks -- the Board a couple of years ago wrote a
 25 letter to everyone who has tanks, asking us to provide the

Page 95

1 have to be mailed out. If you don't get it, then you are
 2 not on my mailing list. I think everybody should be. Just
 3 let me know if you don't get it in the mail, and I can add
 4 you to the list.
 5 MR. BERMAN: This small business item of shifting
 6 of the members of the RAB, I wonder if Jane could provide a
 7 current updated list.
 8 MS. PACKER: Yes, probably next board meeting.
 9 In the offspring to the March meeting, just as usual.
 10 MR. KERN: Thank you. So we got the Landfill 4,
 11 Fill Site 5 tracking thing as an action item. We are
 12 looking at that new list just requested. Thank you.
 13 Any other action items that are coming up?
 14 MR. NELSON: I hope Sam got the copy of the
 15 Battery Howe/Wager.
 16 You are going to be at the committee meeting?
 17 MR. BERMAN: Yes.
 18 MR. NELSON: I'll bring it.
 19 MR. KERN: Other action items can go to Mark.
 20 Any agenda items? Anything that's not covered? Anything
 21 right now besides Landfill 4 that will probably be on the
 22 agenda.
 23 MR. NELSON: Landfill E is on the next one.
 24 MR. BOGGS: I was going to say that.
 25 MR. KERN: Landfill E. For the next RAB meeting

Page 94

1 data so they could be entered into a statewide database
 2 mandated by Gray Davis, and to put our data into an
 3 electronic format that allows most anyone to access it over
 4 the Internet and that would allow someone to pull up a map
 5 let's say in San Francisco. You can click on a site and
 6 see the status, see the plume groundwater concentration,
 7 locate drinking water wells. It's called GO tracker. And
 8 also, I use this data to close out sites.
 9 And the Presidio provided us with about 175 to 200
 10 tanks about a couple of weeks ago. I'm in the process of
 11 having that uploaded so that we can track it and then get
 12 an idea that the groundwater data should be linked to that
 13 groundwater data from the labs. It will be reported to
 14 the state's database, and it will appear so that anyone who
 15 has access to the Internet can see the data.
 16 And so I'm pleased that the Trust has provided me with
 17 that data -- or us with that data. And obviously, I've got
 18 like 200 tanks to close out possibly, so I have a lot work
 19 coming up. But in the long run, it should be accessible to
 20 anyone outside of the room with just a click of the mouse.
 21 That's our goal. So that was a big accomplishment. Thank
 22 you, Nina.
 23 MR. KERN: Very good. Anything else? Any new
 24 business? Anything else?
 25 MS. PACKER: There are copies on the table. They

Page 96

1 and for the committee meeting, we are talking about the Q2
 2 or Q3? Craig, I think we have to break it down.
 3 MR. COOPER: An overview to the Monitoring
 4 Program, break it down into bite-size pieces.
 5 MR. KERN: And possibly one overview we may just
 6 want to pick a site just to expose people to get some depth
 7 on a site.
 8 MR. COOPER: Right.
 9 MR. BERMAN: Probably in first precursor so we
 10 understand the principles.
 11 MR. COOPER: An hour-and-a-half presentation on
 12 groundwater. We will break it down by logical bite-size
 13 pieces and give a bunch of information, but no more than
 14 15 to 20 minutes, and then come back next month and add on
 15 to that and so on.
 16 MR. ULLENSVANG: It may actually be helpful to
 17 take some time. And I agree with you, an hour and a half
 18 on groundwater.
 19 MR. COOPER: I will talk about how to do a step
 20 side approach on groundwater.
 21 MS. CHEEVER: If by any chance anything major
 22 flies, I believe (INAUDIBLE) by the next RAB meeting. I
 23 did write down March, April expected. I think we should
 24 have a presentation on that instead of a discussion.
 25 MR. KERN: Okay.

Page 97

1 MR. NELSON: That will be definitely one that
 2 warrants RAB presentation.
 3 MR. COOPER: Definitely.
 4 MR. HARRIS: While we are asking for things, I
 5 thought I could just sit here and struggle with what I
 6 could ask for, and one of the things I thought about -- I'm
 7 not clear on how this whole organization is set up. I was
 8 just talking just a few minutes ago about -- I know that
 9 there's a Board of Directors which is the Trust Board, and
 10 then there are the employees of the Trust who are, I guess,
 11 responsible for a Board.
 12 Do you have an organizational plan? I guess, that's
 13 my question. I'm not sure all of these pieces fit. Is
 14 there an organizational chart?
 15 MR. NELSON: There's a work chart on the Web site
 16 that shows the executives, the representatives, and the
 17 different departments that report to the director.
 18 MR. FORD: Or we can bring you something.
 19 MS. HARRIS: That would be great. Do we ever
 20 meet with the Board of Director.
 21 MR. NELSON: There are public meetings that we
 22 have and they are announced. Those are usually a couple
 23 times a year. You are welcome to attend those as an
 24 audience member. You have an opportunity to write down
 25 questions.

Page 98

1 MS. HARRIS: But there's no meeting between RAB
 2 and us, and why is that? We just don't ever want to meet
 3 them, or they don't want to meet us?
 4 MR. FORD: We had one about a year ago, and it
 5 didn't turn out that well.
 6 MS. HARRIS: Oh.
 7 MR. KERN: There's some interesting history
 8 around how that meeting evolved -- and what happened. We
 9 can tell you.
 10 MS. YARROS: A committee meeting?
 11 MR. NELSON: The main outlook of the
 12 communication between the RAB and the Trust Board and the
 13 Trust Staff at the formal meeting, and that's the essential
 14 communication link, although, there have been
 15 communications between the RAB and people above the staff
 16 that attend the meeting, written communication with letters
 17 and the like, and the Board is regularly updated by us on
 18 what's going on with the mediation relationship to the
 19 public and the agencies, et cetera.
 20 MS. HARRIS: Well, I think it's something we can
 21 mention that we want to talk about at another time and talk
 22 about how the two could meet or at least see each other
 23 face-to-face. For example, if I met one of the people on
 24 the street, I wouldn't know them, nor would they know me.
 25 I think since we are working so close together and have so

Page 99

1 much in common, it may not be a bad idea. Maybe get a
 2 chance to meet each other face-to-face.
 3 MR. NELSON: We can have another social.
 4 MS. HARRIS: Great idea. I'll bring a cake.
 5 MS. CHEEVER: Can we discuss this at a less
 6 formal committee meeting?
 7 MR. KERN: Anything else? Any other
 8 announcements? Then thanks everyone for coming out tonight
 9 and for your participation. The meeting is adjourned.
 10 (Whereupon meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.)
 11 ---oOo---

Page 100

1 RAB MEMBERS
 2 Sam Berman
 3 Bob Boggs, EKI
 4 Edward Callanan
 5 Julie Cheever
 6 Craig Cooper
 7 George Ford, Presidio Trust
 8 Willard Harris
 9 Joel Hermann
 10 Julian Hultgren
 11 Doug Kern
 12 Jan Monaghan
 13 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
 14 Peter O'Hara
 15 Jane Packer, Presidio Trust
 16 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
 17 Matt Potter
 18 David Sutter
 19 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
 20 Tracy Wright
 21 Gloria Yaros
 22 Mark Youngkin
 23 ---oOo---

Page 101

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Page 1

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50

MARCH 12, 2002
7:00 p.m.

COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
FREDDIE REPPOND, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Page 2

FACILITATOR KERN: I'd like to take just a moment before I go through the normal welcome and just note that next month, April 2002, we'll be beginning our ninth year. We began in April of 1994, so April of 2002 starts our ninth year. We will complete eight years next month. Let me welcome the community members of the Restoration Advisory Board first. Sort of a thank you for all these years of input and showing up. Welcome to the Presidio Trust and their contractors, the Park Service regulators, and any members of the public who are here tonight. Thanks for being here.

Does everyone have an agenda? Are there any changes or additions or modifications that anyone would like to see to the agenda?

MR. NELSON: George Ford is not here, so Craig and I will be filling in for him. He's ill with the flu. So that's a change to Item B.

FACILITATOR KERN: Any announcements or old business?

MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Doug. We had our planning committee meeting, the regularly scheduled meeting, on February 6th in Building 1750. We talked about a variety of topics. We had a discussion about the newsletter. We had a discussion about ARAR update. We talked about Landfill 4, Fill

Page 3

Site 5, about the documentation and the progress of that project. We had a discussion about the draft RAP for Baker Beach 3, 4, Landfill 6. And we also plan to have a discussion on Landfill E at the next RAB committee meeting. We had a little update on the Mountain Lake letter from the Department of Toxic Substances Control. And just some miscellaneous items. So our next meeting is on the fourth Tuesday of this month. Everybody have the date on that? March 26th at 7:00 o'clock, Building 1750, second-floor conference room. And we'll be talking about Landfill E and other various topics, so we hope to see you all there. Thank you.

FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you, Mark. Any questions?

MR. O'HARA: When can we expect or should we expect some sort of a status report on Mountain Lake for this meeting?

MR. NELSON: It's brief, but it's in here on page 4 of the handout. I'll give you an update on my section as well.

MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else for the committee?

MR. O'HARA: I'd like to make a suggestion on

Page 4

a change in the scheduling of topics on the agenda. I realize it's a little late for that, but I was going to suggest that we move Item 6 to a position between Item 5)B. and Item 5)C.

FACILITATOR KERN: To put the "Regulatory Agency Status Updates/InputsO -- just move it up one?

MR. O'HARA: Just move it up one. If that's not a problem.

FACILITATOR KERN: Any objection? Thank you. MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

FACILITATOR KERN: Anything else before we begin on 5?

Yes, Craig?

MR. COOPER: I think that we had offered to do a groundwater overview of the groundwater monitoring program, and that was on the original agenda. And we have to remove that from tonight's agenda and postpone it, because Jennifer Coates, who was going to do the presentation, has been sick the last couple of days. She's really the right person to do it. So I just talked to her tonight and she said that she's starting to feel better and we could do the groundwater presentation at the next RAB committee meeting or at the next RAB full session, whichever you wish.

FACILITATOR KERN: Any thoughts? Seems like

Page 5

1 it is a RAB meeting thing, so I would stick with having
 2 it at the full meeting because that seems right.
 3 Thanks, Craig. 5)A, Chris, "Project Status Update."
 4 MR. NELSON: Good evening, everyone.
 5 I'm going to be talking about the feasibility study and
 6 a number of other CERCLA projects this evening,
 7 including an item that's been off the agenda for a while
 8 and it's coming back on the agenda and presentations,
 9 which is exciting news.
 10 So we will start off with the feasibility study. As I
 11 reported at the past couple of meetings, there were a
 12 couple of investigations that occurred last year and now
 13 all of the data is out on the street. I sent out the
 14 soil gas investigation report of Battery Howe/Wagner in
 15 January. And essentially right now I would welcome any
 16 comments on that. Or you could reserve comments on that
 17 particular investigation and the outcome on it for the
 18 feasibility study itself.
 19 Also, late last month I sent out the sampling
 20 report including the data and figures for the Addendum
 21 No. 4 installation. That was Building 215, Building
 22 1224-45, Building 1750, Building 1351, etc. And that
 23 report is now on the street and it's in the library.
 24 And I'm happy to say that our notification
 25 procedures worked seamlessly. I sent an E-mail to our

Page 6

1 librarian and she sent out an E-mail to everyone. And I
 2 hope people received them. Unfortunately, there isn't a
 3 copy here tonight, which is something we promised to do,
 4 but there are some other reports that were released that
 5 are here.
 6 Moving right along, on the feasibility study
 7 report itself, the schedule that was released in January
 8 at the bimonthly meeting indicated that the FS would
 9 come out in April. And all things being equal, assuming
 10 things get resolved, with clean-up levels and ARARs we
 11 should be able to make that schedule, as far as I can
 12 tell at this time.
 13 Now, the ARARs on the installation sites will
 14 be revised based on DTSC and Regional Board comments.
 15 And any other additional formatting changes we are going
 16 to make after the Landfill 4, Fill Site 5 ARAR
 17 resolution has occurred.
 18 And I'm going to interject a little bit of Landfill 4,
 19 Fill Site 5 information into the feasibility study,
 20 because that's kind of what's been keeping the ARAR on
 21 the installation from moving forward. It's currently
 22 down to one particular issue that is being discussed at
 23 the top level of the two organizations. The
 24 superintendent of the GGNRA and our state acting
 25 executive director have had the information run by them

Page 7

1 and they're discussing it. The intention is to get a
 2 resolution and move forward from there.
 3 Unfortunately, I do not have a time schedule
 4 for that right now. Maybe Brian or Craig may have some
 5 more information.
 6 MR. COOPER: We can discuss that. I know it's
 7 a specific agenda item, so we might want to postpone
 8 discussion on that and do it all at one time.
 9 MR. NELSON: Okay. One other item that the
 10 feasibility study is tied to is the levels that we
 11 proposed. We had an additional meeting with DTSC along
 12 with our consultants and the Park Service last week to
 13 finalize it and our understanding of DTSC comments and
 14 provide them with an initial look at some revised
 15 clean-up numbers. We're currently honing in our revised
 16 document and the table of the numbers. And we should be
 17 able to issue that whole package to the DTSC and the
 18 stakeholders later this month.
 19 FACILITATOR KERN: May I ask a question on
 20 that? It seemed to me that the level discussion was
 21 around the averaging issue on the eco numbers. Has that
 22 made progress? Were the individual cleanup numbers
 23 resolved or the process resolved, or how did that work
 24 out?
 25 MR. NELSON: In some cases, the numbers have

Page 8

1 come down to reflect those concerns. In other cases,
 2 they did not. And because there's four different
 3 pathologies here -- we have human health, recreational,
 4 industrial, and residential.
 5 And within the ecological exposure we have special
 6 status and non-special status. We kind of took a look
 7 across the board at where these numbers were falling and
 8 where it was going to make a difference. Craig can
 9 probably go into a little more detail on some of the
 10 particular items that we've been addressing.
 11 But the short answer is, yeah, in some cases they did go
 12 to where DTSC was more comfortable.
 13 FACILITATOR KERN: Really, bottom line is, are
 14 all the numbers resolved? Is that --
 15 MR. COOPER: Not yet. Actually, just tonight
 16 we met with DTSC a couple of times to better understand
 17 their comments. At their request we took a hard look at
 18 our process once again, took a look at situations; for
 19 example, they mentioned mercury, where the averaging
 20 process may not have ended up with the correct number.
 21 So we basically started from scratch and went
 22 chemical by chemical and looked at every single chemical
 23 once again; took a look at the process we used to come
 24 up with cleanup levels, identified what was the driving
 25 basis for that number; and then just took a step back

Page 9

1 and said, "Do we believe that's a protective number?
2 How does it compare with other sites? How does it
3 compare with just the overall protectiveness?O
4 And so what I just handed to Bob and Brian was a copy of
5 a summary of that.

6 And we did -- just as Chris said -- we revised
7 down some numbers. And now Bob is doing to take a look
8 at it and talk to his eco risk assessor and get back to
9 us.

10 MR. BOGGS: We're probably three-quarters of
11 our way through that process of actually getting them
12 selected. There's still a few of potential concern.

13 A couple of these that we're looking at are
14 probably going to be dictated by detectiveness; that's
15 going to become mandatory. I need to get in special
16 studies to do some stuff, but to get certifiable
17 analyses we're probably going to be looking at
18 detection. And some of these -- pesticides, et cetera
19 -- have very low levels that they show some minute
20 effects; consequently a few of those things are very low
21 numbers. And so we're having to look at whether this is
22 even justifiable.

23 Some of these numbers, as Craig has said, have
24 been adjusted lower; for example, with mercury our eco
25 risk assessor said the number using the average is too

Page 11

1 FACILITATOR KERN: If you guys think that
2 you'll be ready around the next committee meeting?

3 MR. COOPER: I could talk about the changes
4 that the Trust has proposed. But what's really going to
5 count is Bob's reactions to those changes, so I don't
6 know -- the next committee meeting is the 26th. That
7 might be too soon. Up to Bob.

8 MR. BOGGS: Probably the committee meeting
9 will be too soon. Probably the RAB meeting would be
10 pretty much achievable. I'm gone next week; so if
11 there's another flip-flop back and forth and exchange
12 before we get it resolved, it might be tight to commit
13 to the committee meeting.

14 FACILITATOR KERN: Do you think it's
15 reasonable to shoot for the next RAB meeting? We can
16 say tonight we'll put it on the agenda and shoot for it.

17 MR. COOPER: Okay. So we have the
18 groundwater presentation and cleanup levels update for
19 the April RAB.

20 MR. NELSON: One of the things that we're
21 doing is to sort of simplify the review of the final
22 document -- if the document will have any of the changes
23 in it that have been made since the draft. There will
24 be an appendix which includes the responsiveness summary
25 of comments from all of the agencies and our responses.

Page 10

1 high. And he really wanted to see both the high number
2 and the low number and have us make some sort of
3 rational decision based on those two numbers. So that's
4 what they have provided here -- both those numbers, like
5 you requested. And they've kind of gone through and
6 highlighted which ones they're proposing as the cleanup
7 level.

8 Like I said, in three-quarters of these we're
9 pretty much in agreement. There's about a quarter of
10 them that I have to go back with my ecological risk
11 assessor and get his buy-off that these are the
12 appropriate levels.

13 He also had a couple action items to do for this. And
14 he has been extremely busy. And actually I and my
15 supervisor have been trying to schedule his time to deal
16 with this issue as well. He's the best we've got and
17 every base wants him.

18 FACILITATOR KERN: Is the Park Service totally
19 involved in this?

20 MR. BOGGS: Yes.

21 FACILITATOR KERN: So maybe it would be nice,
22 since there's been some changes, that we could have some
23 discussion around the changes at a committee meeting or
24 something to explain kind of like the ARARs

25 MR. COOPER: Okay.

Page 12

1 And also an appendix to that would be a red-lined
2 version of the pages that were changed and also the new
3 tables that basically had the changes, so you could do a
4 side-by-side comparison if you wanted to do that. But
5 we'll definitely have a discussion about where the
6 things fell out and the numbers that changed.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Thank you.

8 MR. NELSON: I wish I could make a mark like
9 this on the next slide [indicating]. A little misfire
10 on the typing.

11 On Landfill E we're making good progress, which
12 I'm happy to report. Last week we met with our
13 consultants Erlin & Kalinowski and Golder and the Park
14 Service to basically have a brainstorming session. We
15 took the data quality objectives that I believe were
16 created by the Trust and the Park Service. And we
17 pitched it to them and we sat down for the better part
18 of the day essentially coming up with ways to
19 investigate and come out how we're going to conduct the
20 investigation such that we could stay within a level
21 where we were (a) meeting objectives and (b) at a
22 reasonable cost. That was a very successful meeting.

23 What came out of that was a revised table that
24 had the information from the meeting that was dumped
25 into data quality objectives table. I had intended to

Page 13

1 hand that out tonight, but I understand late in the day
2 there were some questions about whether something was
3 appropriately addressed from last week's meeting, so we
4 need to take another week to take a look at it. We have
5 a meeting on the 26th, so I have the rest of this week
6 and next week to get it revised and to you so we will
7 have it in time for the meeting.

8 MR. COOPER: This is definitely something we
9 could discuss on the 26th, just to show that we've made
10 progress what we're going to be handing out on the 26th
11 would be a table that will look just like this, where we
12 have the original investigation objectives that we had
13 at the brainstorming meeting on with DTSC and RAB
14 members. Then when you read across that, we have a
15 specific fill investigation strategy that basically
16 links with each objective so you'll see the waste
17 objective.

18 And you'll be able to read across to see how
19 we're linking, what we're going to be doing in the
20 field, or what kind of data review we'll do to address
21 each objective.
22 And then associated with that, we'll hand out a map of
23 Landfill E, so when we say we're going to put in some
24 trenches then you'll see where the proposed trenches are
25 located.

Page 14

1 The map is a little bit messy, because we've
2 left off all of the old data points -- the old trenches
3 and the old groundwater monitoring wells, but then we
4 have got our symbols for our proposed groundwater
5 monitoring wells and trenches and soil gas and probes
6 and all of them kind of lined up here, so it's little
7 bit hard to read. I believe we'll be able to walk it
8 through for everybody. So this is definitely in a
9 position where we can finally discuss it at the
10 committee meeting.

11 MR. PONTON: Landfill E is out of the FS?

12 MR. NELSON: No. It's still in the FS. The
13 way that the feasibility study is the detailed analysis
14 of the alternatives will be done. What won't be done is
15 the preferred alternative. It won't be presented
16 basically. It will be Section 11 of the report, so
17 it'll be blind or silent on that issue. And there will
18 be some language inserted in the appropriate section
19 that talks about how we're conducting an investigation
20 to help further refine our evaluation of alternatives
21 and select the preferred alternative.

22 That will basically be an appendix to the FS
23 and it probably comes out at a later time. Or it may
24 catch up to it, depending on how long the FS and RAP
25 process goes, but the final remedy for the landfill site

Page 15

1 should come out with the main installation RAP. I mean
2 that's the plan at this point.

3 And I think you'll see from the table and the
4 figure we've got a lot of things going out on there from
5 soil gas probes to CPT, a test which measures
6 resistivity of soils as you push through it, gives you a
7 lot of information about pathology. We are collecting
8 some trench samples and observing waste materials. We
9 are also putting in a monitoring well or two -- I'm not
10 sure how many. We're also shooting three separate
11 cross-sections using geophysical techniques. So there's
12 going to be a whole variety of things to meet all the
13 different objectives that we identified last year.
14 So you're free of homework. You'll get it next week,
15 and you'll have homework for the following week. As
16 soon as it's ready, we'll send it out.

17 FACILITATOR KERN: I have a question about the
18 FS part of this. We haven't really talked about that.
19 It's been kind of announced at a couple of meetings that
20 there would be this detailed analysis of alternatives in
21 the FS on landfill but not the preferred alternative
22 selected, but we're also going to do this other
23 investigation to refine the detailed analysis. How will
24 you be able to do a detailed analysis without the
25 additional data that you're collecting, since we've

Page 16

1 determined it to be pretty necessary.

2 MR. COOPER: We might have to redo the nine
3 criteria analysis basically. If the information from
4 our investigations shows that the original nine criteria
5 analysis has real inaccuracies, was based on data that
6 isn't as accurate or up-to-date, then we will have to
7 redo the nine criteria analysis and then have the
8 recommended alternatives attached to that, so this
9 appendix to the FS is like Chris actually said --

10 MR. NELSON: It may actually be fairly thick.
11 It could be a data submittal with all the landfill data
12 and how that's incorporated into the nine criteria if
13 necessary.

14 MR. COOPER: We'll probably do it in two
15 steps. First will be a data report just for the
16 investigation itself, saying this is what we were going
17 to go out to do and this is what the data says. Then we
18 can all look at that at the same time and then we'll
19 make a decision as to how to append the FS. Should we
20 do the nine criteria all over again and go with the
21 recommended remedy, or can we just go straight to a
22 recommended remedy?

23 FACILITATOR KERN: Can you describe what the
24 alternatives are, now that you're going to analyze in
25 this version, since you would already know, since you're

1 not going to wait?

2 MR. COOPER: Right. What we've discussed is
3 that we're looking at both the capping and the full
4 excavation, so this investigation will help us analyze
5 hybrids in between, also. That's still on the radar
6 screen. That hasn't slipped off. Your point is that
7 the range of alternatives is not going to have the
8 hybrid in it?
9 Yeah. So the nine criteria will probably have to be
10 redone.

11 FACILITATOR KERN: That is what I was getting
12 at. Okay.

13 MR. COOPER: That's further to the west.

14 MR. NELSON: Just briefly, the issue is
15 essentially the size of the landfill. There was an
16 estimation done in '98 by EKI that there were these side
17 portions of fill occurring. That wasn't clear from the
18 earlier photos of the topography whether it was just a
19 dump or movement of earth to build roads or other types
20 of things, so that soil hasn't been characterized, so it
21 may or may not be included as parts of the landfill. It
22 may be excluded if it's clean or if it's below levels.
23 Then also -- one of the shortcomings that's been pointed
24 out -- there's no real data from the bottom of the
25 landfill to the center and also within the waste profile

1 itself.

2 There were some surface soil samples collected
3 and some of the borings were not very good
4 characterizing what was actually in the waste, so there
5 may be a better way to characterize the soil and how
6 contaminated it is and what's in it. But the
7 contingencies are basically to avoid drilling a certain
8 number of feet below the bottom of the landfill. In
9 other words, if you start to get into native soil and
10 you see it in the drill cuttings, you know you're pretty
11 close to the top of the cemetery. And that's when it's
12 time work gingerly and not continue to go down.

13 MR. PONTON: I thought there was evidence of
14 bone or something in the fill.

15 MR. NELSON: There was a femur that was
16 recovered in one of the trenches that was essentially
17 done for an archaeological investigation that was done
18 in the mid '90s. If you look at the map in this work
19 plan you can see there were a number of investigations
20 where trenches were done -- and one, I think, refers to
21 that particular site. That's a definite concern.

22 MR. PONTON: That data doesn't help you to
23 identify the thickness of the fill?

24 MR. NELSON: The thickness on that edge maybe,
25 but it doesn't necessarily account for composition

1 throughout or certainly not in the middle, where there
2 have been no data.

3 Any other questions on Public Health?

4 Moving along to another CERCLA site that is on the radar
5 screen -- actually it was on the screen last April, and
6 it fell off and now is back on. It's Building 215, a
7 very nondescript building [indicating]. It's basically
8 in the main post at the bottom of the parade ground.
9 It's kind of near where the old Burger King used to be.
10 Last April, there were some Trust crews trenching
11 through the area. It's a known CERCLA site within the
12 main installation and they encountered some stained soil
13 that had a strong odor of petroleum. This trench was
14 being dug to install a new water line for some
15 improvements that were being done in the area.

16 And essentially what happened is that the Trust
17 wanted to try to address the issue at the time. And
18 there was some push-back on whether it was a good idea
19 to go out and do a full characterization of the site and
20 clean it up without folding the entire site into the
21 main installation RAP.

22 As a result of some meetings with DTSC, it
23 turns out that this is one of the sites that had some
24 significant data gaps. And DTSC was not comfortable
25 with conceptually agreeing on a remedy for the site.

1 And they requested that we take some additional samples.
2 There were a couple of underground tanks that were
3 removed by the Army in the late '80s; and no
4 contamination was essentially reported, so it was kind
5 of curious.

6 We went back out and did quite a bit of
7 additional sampling, going further out laterally as well
8 as vertically. And essentially what turns out to be
9 case at the site is that the contamination that was
10 found in April is the only contamination that is
11 remaining that has been discovered during the
12 investigation that exceeds any levels. It's basically
13 petroleum, which is a non-CERCLA contaminant.
14 We put forth a proposal to the DTSC and the Regional
15 Board that we go out there and clean up the site from
16 the petroleum standpoint and get the contamination away
17 so that the Trust can use the facility for its future
18 plans.

19 Planning and transportation department right
20 now want to turn it into a transit hub for local transit
21 authorities and the Presidio Trust shuttle and what not.
22 So we would be able to close out the additional issues,
23 such as the CERCLA contamination which appears to be
24 nonexistent in the main installation feasibility study
25 en route. And I submitted a letter to Jim.

Page 21

1 MR. PONTON: I really don't know what to do
2 with it. We'll talk about it off line. I don't know
3 how to go forward.

4 MR. NELSON: Perhaps you and I and Bob can sit
5 down and talk about what can be done to deal with the
6 petroleum, but not go outside the CERCLA process or the
7 CEQA process or those other things that we want to
8 follow.

9 Other CERCLA continued: The contingency plan
10 is another document that's essentially been held up as a
11 result of our level discussion and our ARARs. We are
12 eager to get this document back on track and get it
13 approved, because it's tied to the Letterman
14 development.

15 And it's important that this contingency plan
16 and removal action work plan be approved in order to
17 meet all of our agreements with the Lucas people on the
18 Letterman project, so that would be something you should
19 be hopefully keeping an eye out for in the next couple
20 of months as a draft document for review.

21 That's all I have for now. Craig is going to
22 take over from here and finish up the additional slides
23 from George's material. Does anybody have any questions
24 on things that I talked about?

25 MR. HARRIS: Just one question back to

Page 22

1 Landfill E. You had given out or we had received some
2 objectives a while back -- are those the same objectives
3 that --

4 MR. COOPER: Same ones. On that table over to
5 the far left-hand corner.

6 MR. HARRIS: The same ones that we had
7 received before?

8 MR. NELSON: You had received and you actually
9 had helped develop.
10 Any more questions? Okay, thank you.

11 MR. COOPER: So I'm going to finish out the
12 discussion on Landfill 4 Fill site 5. That's our first
13 interim RAP that we hope to get out to you very soon.
14 I know that we're going to have a discussion of ARARs,
15 so I'm not going into that at this point. I do want
16 everybody to know that although we've been working hard
17 on the ARARs this year, there are other issues that need
18 to get resolved so we can get this interim RAP out.
19 That includes writing the interim RAP, complying at
20 least a draft interim RAP for people to comment on.

21 Putting together an administrative record
22 that's compiling all the documents that support this
23 interim RAP. Putting together a proposed plan that will
24 include a fact sheet that will announce the public
25 comment period and so on. And putting together the

Page 23

1 documentation for CEQA, so all that work has been going
2 on concurrently with our discussions on the ARARs issue.
3 I'd just like to introduce Dorinda Shipman from
4 Treadwell and Rollo. She is the Trust contractor that
5 is basically working on those particular documents --
6 the interim RAP, the proposed plan, putting together
7 administrative record, and so on.

8 FACILITATOR KERN: Are there any other interim
9 activities or concurrent activities that can be going on
10 while this ARAR thing is going on?

11 MR. COOPER: Another thing that actually did
12 make it on the list is George's working with Treadwell
13 and Rollo actually putting together the RAP
14 implementation plan, so we write an interim RAP; then
15 the next step after that is writing a work plan saying
16 this is how we're going to implement it. Basically these
17 are both excavation projects, so it's a work plan
18 describing how we're going to dig into these landfills
19 and dig it up and where will the waste be taken to and
20 what's the transportation plan.

21 And that implementation work plan is also being
22 worked on and moving along quite well. That also goes
23 into -- after we dig out these landfills we've got these
24 levels that we need to achieve. So then we have soil
25 confirmation strategy where we're going to take samples

Page 24

1 after all the waste is gone. We sample the soil to make
2 sure it's in compliance with the levels. That's why
3 we're calling it an interim RAP, because the levels
4 aren't quite done yet. So Dorinda has worked on that,
5 and that's pretty much 90 percent complete, wouldn't you
6 say?

7 MS. SHIPMAN: Yeah, it's just waiting for any
8 other changes or comments. And we got comments from the
9 Board that we've addressed, and we're waiting for any
10 other comments. The other thing we're working on are
11 the plans and specifications that will eventually go
12 into the bid package for those sites.

13 MR. COOPER: You're putting together the plans
14 and specs right now. Then we'll have to bid it out. So
15 we don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves. We're
16 not going to bid it out until the RAP is signed; that's
17 for sure.

18 MR. PONTON: I know we talked about cleanup
19 levels for different species and different formations.
20 I guess I've always assumed we're going to be moving
21 stuff from the Presidio. If we ever import material
22 what levels -- do you ever imagine you may need to
23 import soil?

24 MR. COOPER: For these projects I don't think
25 we're importing fill, but there are rules and regulation

1 about bringing in fill to a national park. And I don't
 2 know --
 3 MR. PONTON: And is that going to be part of
 4 the --
 5 MR. COOPER: But for Landfill 4 and Fill Site
 6 5 --
 7 MR. PONTON: I'm looking ahead to some other
 8 projects way down the road.
 9 MR. NELSON: It would have to be the
 10 appropriate levels for soil to be placed at a site.
 11 And it most likely wouldn't be just levels. It would be
 12 all sorts of specs. Is it appropriate for the type of
 13 plants that are going to be grown there? Or is it
 14 appropriate from a compaction stand, where it's going
 15 beneath a road or a building?
 16 MR. COOPER: It would probably be
 17 site-specific from a particular implementation work plan
 18 where we need to bring in fill. I'm not aware of one at
 19 this point.
 20 MR. ULLENSVANG: Landfill E called for a
 21 hundred thousand yards of fill, wasn't that true?
 22 MR. NELSON: It's been revised. I think it's
 23 more like fifty thousand or something.
 24 MR. PONTON: At that point we won't have to go
 25 through this whole process again.

1 MR. NELSON: I envision perhaps the exception
 2 of landfill of excavation completely and then back
 3 filling. I'm hoping that we can use -- we're going to
 4 have a soil balance that's way wacked out. If we
 5 consider all the landfills that we're digging out and
 6 then you also consider the excavation of LAIR where
 7 we're going to knock the building down and go into the
 8 dirt for a parking lot. I think there's a couple
 9 hundred thousand yards of sand we're looking to get rid
 10 of. So on balance I'd say we got more to get rid of or
 11 manage in-house than bringing in.
 12 MR. PONTON: There was a discussion a while
 13 back that we needed sand.
 14 MR. NELSON: Right, that was for graded area
 15 9, yeah.
 16 MR. PONTON: There was a window of opportunity
 17 to get some sand from south of here, and then that
 18 passed.
 19 MR. NELSON: Golden Gate Park sand was
 20 available, and then it wasn't. And the cost was
 21 prohibitive to import the appropriate type of sand from
 22 Monterey.
 23 MR. PONTON: So the sand from Letterman would
 24 work?
 25 MR. NELSON: I don't think it would work. I

1 think it's probably mixed with coal.
 2 MR. PONTON: But that scenario will be worked
 3 out at another time?
 4 MR. COOPER: On a site-specific basis, right.
 5 MR. PONTON: For any kind of projects like
 6 that where the soil would have to be of known quality
 7 and quantity?
 8 MR. COOPER: I'm sure there's probably even an
 9 ARAR about it.
 10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Was there ever a soil
 11 management plan talking about the movement of soil?
 12 MR. NELSON: Yes. The contingency plan has a
 13 section on the movement of soil.
 14 MR. PONTON: Have we picked up that ARAR
 15 somewhere along the line?
 16 MR. COOPER: For?
 17 MR. PONTON: Import of what you just
 18 described.
 19 MR. NELSON: It probably would be handled on a
 20 site-by-site basis, I would think. There's no import in
 21 5, is there? It's only export.
 22 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's always the
 23 possibility that there would be some incidental need at
 24 any of the sites. We might need to fill out some
 25 grading that couldn't be accomplished from the

1 cut-and-border area of the removal, as there has been so
 2 far in these things. There's been dirt removal that
 3 needed to be replaced. It's been handled differently
 4 pretty much on a site-specific basis, such that the
 5 material is appropriate for the reuse.
 6 MR. PONTON: It just seems like we are
 7 fine-tuning the numbers as conservatively as we can be.
 8 That seems to be the direction. And hopefully we can
 9 still identify the sources of the material should we
 10 need it, or --
 11 MR. COOPER: I see where you're going.
 12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Some material has been
 13 quarried material in the past. I think that it's
 14 important to look at where it's coming from. I think we
 15 can make a reasonable assumption that it's coming from a
 16 clean source and not one that's potentially
 17 contaminated, but up to this point it's been on a
 18 site-specific basis.
 19 MR. BOGGS: I was at a statewide military
 20 facilities conference last week where that issue came
 21 up. I can bring up the new buzzword -- LUCIP, or land
 22 use control implementation plan. Basically it's going
 23 to be all the land-use controls and covenants and deed
 24 restrictions.
 25 If the Presidio had a deed it would be placed

Page 29

1 on all these sites controlling how you're going to
2 implement the controls in the future where we're not
3 cleaning up to unrestricted use levels. So issues like
4 that -- what's allowed to be brought in, et cetera, is
5 part of this land-use control that will continue on with
6 any piece that isn't cleaned up to unrestricted use
7 levels.

8 So we had a whole big session on that sort of
9 thing of how we would control the import of soil or
10 control whether a school would ever be built at a
11 certain location. The schools have their own special
12 considerations that haven't been considered in our risk
13 assessment. There's no plans for any schools here, but
14 if ever there is there are additional hoops that they
15 would have to go through, so that will be a topic -- in
16 fact, I'm getting a slide show so I can make a RAB
17 presentation somewhere in the future of where that whole
18 program is ahead.

19 FACILITATOR KERN: If I could bring it back to
20 the topic of what has been going on concurrently during
21 this period, I think one thing you mentioned you had
22 plans and specifications going through the big package
23 that you didn't feel like you can get it bid out until
24 the thing was signed.

25 What I wanted to mention was one thing that has

Page 31

1 familiarity with working together and working with the
2 outside world as an organization was still coming into
3 its own.

4 I can't make any guarantees that there won't be
5 some delays as a result of contracting, but I think we
6 are in a much better position than we were in 1999. One
7 of the things that can be done in advance is to have a
8 strategy meeting with the procurement department and the
9 contracts people and clearly lay out what our intentions
10 are.

11 How we intend to bid the work out and get any
12 input from them, any reservations that they have, any
13 questions that they have so we can get the process going
14 now, Craig, making sure that the bidding process is not
15 a hurdle to the extent that we can control it. It seems
16 like it's going to be a fairly straightforward job,
17 aside from complying with all the ARARs. The digging
18 process should be fairly low-tech.

19 MR. SUTTER: In the contracting do you have to
20 follow ARARs?

21 MR. NELSON: We're kind of in a special
22 situation. We do to the extent that if a job is over
23 \$50,000 we have to get competitive bids. In some cases
24 if it's over \$5,000 we have to get three quotes, but I
25 don't think we are following FAR 100 percent. I think

Page 30

1 happened to us in the past -- I can think back to
2 building 637, maybe the area around the Commissary C
3 area. There have got to be extensive delays and
4 negotiations around the whole bidding process. And I
5 brought that to your attention because I remember at
6 that time that we were kind of ready to go, the RAP was
7 done, or in that case it was a CAP.

8 And then it just ground back down to a halt
9 again because we never really found out what all the
10 negotiations were about, but it just went on forever.
11 So it's another thing to -- I don't know if there's
12 anything that can be done about that, but it certainly
13 would be nice to anticipate trying to have a smooth
14 bidding process and all that back and forth and
15 interviews and renegotiation. And you guys know more
16 about it than I do, but it went on forever.

17 MR. NELSON: I think I can provide a little
18 commentary on that. The first day I worked at the
19 Trust, I went to a working group meeting with Brian and
20 George and Sharon and a bunch of other people where we
21 talked about Building 637. And the idea was we were
22 going to do the CAP and implement the work right away.
23 The Trust was growing very quickly, but our contracting
24 department was quite young -- not "young" as in Cyoung
25 people, O but our process and procedures and our

Page 32

1 we have some exceptions.

2 MR. COOPER: Yeah. I don't know. Let me
3 check that and I can get back to you by the committee
4 meeting. Do you know, Dorinda?

5 MS. SHIPMAN: I thought, as Chris said, that
6 the Trust is exempt from following that to the letter.
7 Your past remediation procurements have not followed FAR
8 exactly but have incorporated some provisions within FAR
9 where the Trust has done what was appropriate for the
10 type job that is being done.

11 MR. NELSON: That's right.

12 MR. COOPER: The next item is on LAIR. I'm not
13 going to read each of the bullets. Basically, things
14 are moving along great. The last bullet talks about
15 when we're going to pull the trunk sewers. And I think
16 if anyone has driven by that area recently that just
17 from looking at it it'll speak for itself.
18 On Mountain Lake, I think Bob will talk about this more
19 in his regulatory update, but he sent out his letter to
20 CalTrans. It seems that CalTrans is willing to come to
21 a meeting and talk about potential liability with the
22 Trust.

23 MR. SUTTER: Hear, hear. Congratulations.

24 MR. COOPER: So Bob will provide some more
25 information on that in his agenda item.

1 And the last item is Crissy Field on the skeet range.
2 Yet another bid process is going on there right now, and
3 bids are due this Friday and anything --
4 Dorinda, you're working on that one?

5 MS. SHIPMAN: We'll be helping the Trust with
6 oversight out there. And the last bullet, when it says
7 the timing isn't known yet, that's the site where the
8 contractor is [inaudible] not to work on the tide, but I
9 think the Trust has left it up to them to suggest when
10 the optimum time for that will be, but they should be
11 talking about that in their bid packages.

12 MR. NELSON: I wrote that last bullet, so I
13 can explain that it's based on a conversation with Jane
14 and some other people who work in the office with the
15 gentleman who is working on this project right now.
16 At the last RAB meeting, we said we would have field
17 work March or April.

18 We kind of revised it to say April or if a
19 contractor has another plan that makes more sense from a
20 standpoint of let's get the work done as easily and as
21 quickly as possible and in a safe fashion that's not
22 going to cause lots of problems, there may be a proposal
23 that the lowest tide is the best time to do this work.
24 And there may be a proposal that is -- we're going to
25 put in some plates and work with the tides the way they

1 are. And they'll probably have to be low but not the
2 lowest tides.

3 That may make more sense, so we will evaluate
4 all the technical merits of the proposals and the bids
5 and see which one looks the best. I'll keep you posted
6 when we get the bids in and we evaluate them on what the
7 schedule looks like on the skeet range.

8 MR. COOPER: That's it for the project status
9 updates.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Bob?

11 MR. BOGGS: Regulatory update. Might as well
12 start with Mountain Lake. Yes. CalTrans did respond.
13 They are not maybe quite as willing as Craig has
14 presented it. They will be coming with an attorney --
15 but they are coming to the table and willing to look at
16 what their part in this whole thing will be, but they're
17 taking -- apparently the attorney is a bit of a bulldog,
18 too; so we'll see. We are shooting to have the meeting
19 the week of April 15th. So far we've got three quarters
20 of the lawyers lined up to attend.

21 MS. CHEEVER: How many parties will be in this
22 meeting?

23 MR. BOGGS: Individuals or --

24 MS. CHEEVER: How many agencies? The DTC and
25 CalTrans, but who else?

1 MR. BOGGS: DTSC; CalTrans; the Water Board,
2 of course, will be invited; the Park Service will be
3 invited; the Trust; and possibly the Army Corps of
4 Engineers.

5 MR. COOPER: We recommend definitely the Army
6 Corps of Engineers.

7 MR. BOGGS: The Park Service and the Trust and
8 DTSC will all have attorneys there. If one attorney is
9 there, they're all going to be there. And so for this
10 initial meeting the attorneys will be there and that way
11 all the staff people can kind of be in agreement on what
12 direction we're going.

13 Legal can be tied into what the process is
14 going to be, what our next steps are doing to be. There
15 will be a lot of meetings where it will just be working
16 staff members working things out, and it is not until we
17 get road blocks that the attorneys will have to jump
18 back in.

19 MR. O'HARA: Bob, I'm trying to think of what
20 the position of the Army is and how do they fit into the
21 spectrum?

22 MR. BOGGS: There were trace levels of
23 pesticides down in the lake sediments, also. Those are,
24 depending on what site models you use, it could have
25 been spill from the roadway or it could have been spill

1 from the golf course.

2 And the way our agency -- in terms of CERCLAs
3 -- it's joint and several liability -- all three of
4 those. So, basically, whenever they find a contaminated
5 site they go back as far as anybody who could have
6 possibly contaminated the site. And, say, you are
7 potentially responsible; they're not assigning
8 responsibility yet or liability or anything. We are
9 just bringing everybody that could possibly have been
10 involved to the table.

11 MR. O'HARA: I fail to see what the difference
12 is between there and situations where there is cleanup
13 that the Trust is assuming responsibility for from the
14 Army. Is there an issue differentiation here?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: If I can jump in, the MOA
16 amongst the Army, Park Service, and Trust is a
17 complicated document. And many of you were around during
18 the time when that was being entered into.
19 The Trust has put forth the argument that in the
20 construction of that document that there is an avenue by
21 which the Army maintained responsibilities for
22 contamination at Mountain Lake due to its proximity to
23 CalTrans. And the argument would proceed that the Army
24 would be responsible for going to CalTrans to get the
25 money. So then the Army would arguably have a role in

1 this process, and the argument would go forth that they
2 would have to chip in the money and go after CalTrans.

3 MR. O'HARA: But that's a site-specific
4 issue.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a location issue. It's
6 a difficult part of the agreement in that it's not
7 clear. It's not spelled out in one sentence what
8 happens here. So the Army has asserted that they
9 interpret that section differently than the Trust does.
10 CalTrans is party to a third-party agreement, so then
11 CalTrans does care what the agreement says. Obviously,
12 they think they have some reason not to be responsible,
13 so that's where a lot of the complications will come.
14 Undoubtedly, the attorneys will be able to talk quite a
15 bit about those issues and who's responsible.

16 MR. COOPER: This will not get resolved in one
17 meeting.

18 MR. O'HARA: But that was part of the MOA.

19 MR. NELSON: The Army does not usually come to
20 the table. We don't normally just call up the Army and
21 say, "Hey, come to a stakeholder meeting."

22 MS. CHEEVER: To what extent is this
23 disagreement holding up the cleanup of the lake and the
24 restoration of the lake that's not part of the cleanup?

25 MR. NELSON: It's holding it up.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Is it all ready to go?

2 MR. NELSON: It doesn't make sense to do one
3 and not the other, because if you're going to do the
4 restoration, there's an overlapping area that includes
5 restoration and remediation that it just makes a lot of
6 sense to do it all at once.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's many phases of the
8 restoration that are outside the area of impact during
9 the remediation -- our proceeding.

10 MS. CHEEVER: I'm talking about the dredging
11 itself. Is it all ready to go but for this?

12 MR. NELSON: No, it's not. There's no RAP for
13 Mountain Lake. There's no RAP for the installation that
14 Mountain Lake is in. We don't have a work plan and
15 design and all that sort of stuff. It's not like all
16 you have to find out is who is going pay and flip the
17 switch. Those activities have been lagging behind as a
18 result of this dispute or disagreement.

19 MR. PONTON: [Inaudible] trace concentrations
20 of pesticides either are low levels, where the model is
21 either run-off from the road or from the golf course
22 possibly?

23 MR. BOGGS: Yes. There are several
24 possibilities.

25 MR. PONTON: Mosquito abatement, stuff that

1 was applied because of mosquitoes in the area, that
2 would be the normal applications of pesticides?

3 MR. BOGGS: That would fall out.

4 MS. CHEEVER: There's lead, too, isn't there?

5 MR. BOGGS: The lead is the largest problem
6 there.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: Maybe to go back to what
8 Julie was saying, I think she was getting at a point
9 that if there are activities that could be ongoing, can
10 they be ongoing now -- planning -- no matter who pays
11 for it, can that be happening?

12 MR. COOPER: To some extent they are, because
13 Mountain Lake is in our feasibility study, so before we
14 can do the remediation, you've got to have a feasibility
15 study done for Mountain Lake, so that is moving forward.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: So then that part is done
17 and the feasibility study is done?

18 MR. COOPER: Mountain Lake is a separate line
19 item in the feasibility study that has the nine criteria
20 analysis for various alternatives and we have a
21 recommended remedy for Mountain Lake. So that's
22 something that needs to get done before any can happen.
23 And, as Chris said, the next step after that would be a
24 RAP. We'd have to talk to Bob to decide whether to keep
25 Mountain Lake in the main installation RAP with all the

1 other main installation sites. Because of this special
2 situation with other PRPs, it's difficult to spin out
3 into a different RAP. We'd have to talk to Bob about
4 that, but that would be the next step. And then after
5 is the implementation work plan that we talked about.

6 After that we write a RAP we have to write a
7 work plan about how we're going to get in there and
8 dredge out those contaminated sediments. And then the
9 plans and specs and getting the dirt, so we have not
10 started working on those yet at all.

11 MR. ANDERSON: Suppose it's found on some
12 happy day that the Trust is not financially responsible
13 for this, does the responsible financial agency then
14 have the responsibility to do all these plans and
15 reports?

16 MR. BOGGS: Well, that's where it gets into
17 some of the legal issues. We actually have a consent
18 agreement with the Trust to cover the cleanup at the
19 Presidio, so most likely DTSC as an agency can go to the
20 Trust for the . Now, whether the Trust goes to the Army
21 to get additional funding from CalTrans, et cetera,
22 that's where the lawyers play in. And I'm not well
23 versed in this arena, but they generally do go after,
24 quote, the responsible party.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Does Caltrans have a

1 remediation program like the Trust does?

2 MR. BOGGS: CalTrans actually has a very
3 extensive remediation program going on for many
4 different projects. They actually have a state fund
5 that's generated for spills along roadways -- somebody
6 drops a drum off a truck, they have to go out and clean
7 it up -- so they actually have people that are versed in
8 this.

9 MR. SUTTER: So you're saying that essentially
10 whoever pays for the work, the Trust will implement it.

11 MR. ANDERSON: The Trust would like to take
12 control of the project, no matter who's responsible for
13 it. The Park Service and the Trust would work together
14 to do that

15 MR. BOGGS: One of the problems that
16 restoration involves is moving storm drainage along
17 CalTrans that currently drains into the lake. So,
18 regardless, CalTrans has to do a portion of the project
19 by rerouting the storm drains from sensitive habitat.
20 So we are tied to CalTrans regardless in some ways.
21 Because this requires a permit if the Trust is going to
22 move those storm drains for them, they require a permit.

23 MR. COOPER: Just so people get an idea where
24 I'm envisioning how this will go, there will be a
25 settlement where all these various parties will sign a

1 government OMF conference was very educational. They
2 brought all the project managers together that are
3 working with various military facilities throughout the
4 state. We were hoping it was a boondoggle, but they had
5 us in session a solid eight hours a day.

6 A couple of things that came up with levels.
7 There was some discussion regarding lead levels,
8 different sites using different things. We used
9 LeadSpread to come up with a number. We are kind of in
10 that area that's good.

11 Similarly with PCBs -- they revised this table
12 per a comment we had. The Trust was initially going
13 with the residential PCB level of one part per million,
14 what is what's specified in COSCA [?] instead of
15 regulations. In California we like it to be based on
16 the actual risk assessment, if you do that it comes out
17 to 0.23 rather than one part per million. Again, it's
18 an issue that's being carried up. Some sites are only
19 cleaning up to 1.0 and others to 0.23, and the Trust has
20 agreed to clean up to 0.23.

21 MR. COOPER: At the eco sites.

22 MR. BOGGS: No. Residential.

23 MR. COOPER: I have to look at my table real
24 fast. We can talk about that afterward.

25 MR. BOGGS: My mistake. I read the wrong

1 letter -- and CalTrans and the Army, based on whatever
2 is decided, starting from zero on up they will do
3 basically what we call in this context "cash out PRPs,"
4 where they will write out a check. Basically it will go
5 into a specific fund designated for the Mountain Lake ;
6 and then they are basically absolved of any future
7 liability.

8 And cash-out PRPs -- generally there's a whole
9 strategy of why you want to be a work PRP and then some
10 PRPs like to be work PRPs. There's advantages to that
11 and some disadvantages, which I can talk about more.
12 But I think that's generally the way I'm envisioning
13 things to go.

14 MR. BOGGS: That is typically what we call a
15 VCA, or voluntary agreement, if all the parties can come
16 to an agreement on the cash-out settlement, et cetera.
17 And then we have -- same thing -- they're all going to
18 sign up for it and we will also designate the lead PRP,
19 i.e., Trust that's going to manage the cleanup and be
20 the trustee of those funds for overseeing their cleanup.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: What's the first "P" in PRP
22 stand for?

23 MR. COOPER: "Potential." No one ever admits
24 to full liability.

25 MR. BOGGS: Mountain Lake now. Statewide

1 column, so there's still things to be discussed.
2 Had a good session on land use controls and implementing
3 plans. There was some discussion on feasibility cost
4 estimates. Basically, our director has decided that
5 cost estimates for sites must include loss of property
6 value, so when you clean up a site to unrestricted use,
7 you must consider that cost estimate -- how much you're
8 losing in property value because you're not going to be
9 able to re-sell the property because of the deed
10 restriction for the same price as if it was clean.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Is that to encourage clean
12 closure?

13 MR. BOGGS: Yes. It basically makes it
14 advantageous for clean closure. And they will also have
15 a closer look at these long-term stewardship costs for
16 these sites and maintaining these land-use covenants and
17 that sort of thing. There was talk regarding RCRA
18 versus CERCLA -- two bodies of regulation. We primarily
19 operate under CERCLA. We don't really have any
20 RCRA-permitted units. So we had issues on that.
21 We had a whole session on unexploded ordinance -- that
22 was really scary.

23 And we also had a bunch of sessions on
24 different technologies that are being used for cleanup,
25 but it was a very good conference.

Page 45

1 Skeet range. We've been working on correcting some
2 errors that were in the work plan. We've worked those
3 out, so that's ready to be approved by our department,
4 and they gave you an update on that.
5 Building 215.

6 We got Chris's report. That's basically going
7 to get delegated over to the Water Board's approval,
8 basically because of workload any petroleum sites PTSC
9 is going to do so a screening to make sure that there's
10 no CERCLA contaminant of concern. We were concerned at
11 building 215 because there was a paint shop there at one
12 time. They may have had solvents, et cetera, so they
13 went through and did testing and all they found was
14 petroleum that was above cleanup levels, so we will just
15 sign off the approval letter that the Water Board has
16 delegation on how they will clean that up.
17 Landfills 4 and 5.

18 I got an update on CEQA documents that are
19 required for CEQA. We have new guidance that came out
20 this past year, and we got that over to George and are
21 waiting for some ARARs to get resolved.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: We'll be resolving those
23 tonight.

24 MR. BOGGS: I'll turn it over to you.

25 FACILITATOR KERN: I'd like to briefly check

Page 47

1 point where I feel comfortable importing it again.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Are these tanks in place or
3 removed?

4 MR. PONTON: Tanks that have been removed that
5 leaked. It's called LUST database -- leaky underground
6 storage tank. And they basically close them one by one
7 through a [inaudible] process. And the last thing --

8 MR. NELSON: Further proof, Jim, that nothing
9 is simple at the Presidio. You can't even get the tanks
10 in the database without crashing the system.

11 MR. PONTON: There was a problem that when the
12 new data was sent, some of the old tank I.D. numbers
13 were duplicates so it got screwed up. And we extracted
14 it. And I haven't had time to proof the new data. Our
15 database person was pretty upset with me.

16 FACILITATOR KERN: We're onto to Item 5)C.
17 This is the ARAR discussion. I'd like to remind people
18 as we go into this, I have some personal frustration,
19 but I would like to ask people if you do have any
20 frustration like I do then target the issues and not any
21 people tonight.

22 I think staff is working diligently towards
23 trying to get a resolution, but I think there's a
24 certain amount of frustration around this topic that's
25 reasonable and perhaps needs to come out. So I would

Page 46

1 in with our reporter and see how you're doing. We're
2 going to go into perhaps a longer discussion, and would
3 it be appropriate for a brief break?

4 [The reporter declined a break.]

5 FACILITATOR KERN: My apologies to Jim. You
6 had something under Item 6.

7 MR. PONTON: I need to talk to Chris about
8 Building 215. I'm not too clear about a couple of
9 things. And I worked with Jennifer on approving a
10 revision to the sampling plan of groundwater that was a
11 quick turnaround.

12 Worked with Jennifer again to approve a letter
13 she had written about Landfill E seep sampling. They
14 make the seeps flow to sample them for range of tremors,
15 so we have an idea of what's coming off the landfill.
16 She did a good job with that and made a modification to
17 include hydrocarbons in the analysis.

18 I've been working with Jennifer again on
19 importing about 200 tanks into our database that will be
20 uploaded into a statewide database to show plumes and to
21 allow electronic data reporting to the State so that
22 people can access it through the Web. Anyone can access
23 it, and the first time we imported it, there was a
24 problem that kind of screwed up the master database so
25 we had to extract everything, so I haven't got to the

Page 48

1 also ask you to take your time and be very clear and ask
2 questions regarding the subject.

3 I guess I'll open this discussion item by
4 saying we have learned tonight that there's still no
5 final resolution on the ARARs discussion. My
6 understanding is that one item was resolved, and that
7 was that the GMPA is now going to be allowed as an ARAR
8 for Area A sites; would that be correct?

9 MR. COOPER: Right.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: That's an agreement we can
11 applaud and be happy about it. They have come to an
12 agreement on it. I understand that the Area A MOA has
13 not yet been inserted or discarded and that an
14 additional item has come up, which is that the Organic
15 Act is being asked to be included. So maybe to start
16 this off I would ask the agencies if you have any words
17 that you want to say at the beginning. You can make a
18 brief presentation or statement and then I would ask RAB
19 members to ask you some questions, if that's
20 appropriate, and we could flip or you could choose or
21 whatever you want to do.

22 MR. O'HARA: I think that, at least for myself
23 and the probably for most of my colleagues here, could
24 you in a sentence or two -- certainly not a diatribe --
25 explain what the issue is objectively. And my sense is

1 that either one or the other of you can make a statement
2 of what the issue is. And then I think I'd certainly
3 like to hear your philosophical approach to this issue,
4 whether to include it or not include it.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that's very fair, and
6 I would suggest that we each talk a little bit about the
7 two ARARs that are not agreed to right now so that any
8 bias either of us might impose -- an alternative bias
9 could be imposed by that person, not that either of us
10 will intentionally do it, but we're representing our
11 agencies' viewpoints.

12 Craig, would you like to start? Or would you
13 like me to?

14 MR. COOPER: Go ahead.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm going to try to --
16 there's a significant number of nuances to each of these
17 potential ARARs. I'm probably not going to give them
18 full justice, because I'm not an attorney, but I will
19 try not to oversimplify. And forgive me if it's still
20 more complex than the one or two sentences you asked
21 for.

22 The two items that the Park Service is
23 requesting be ARARs are the Park Service Organic Act and
24 the Area A MOA among the Presidio Trust and the Park
25 Service.

1 With respect to the Organic Act, the Organic
2 Act is a law which is very fundamental to the purpose of
3 the Park Service. Talking about preservation and
4 protection against impairment of the resources within
5 the Park system and protecting those resources for
6 future generations. And it's a large law, but those are
7 some of its central tenets.

8 Within that law we are suggesting that it
9 would be an ARAR for sites within Area A and that it
10 would be an applicable regulation to be actually applied
11 to work in Area A based on a couple reasons: one, that
12 the Presidio Trust, we believe, is within the Golden
13 Gate National Recreation Area and the land in Area B is
14 similar to the Park Service land adjacent to it. We're
15 asking that the Organic Act be a relevant and
16 appropriate law for work being done in Area B.

17 "Relevant and appropriate" doesn't mean that it
18 doesn't actually apply to the Trust but, because of
19 similarities and the functional sameness that the land
20 in the Trust's jurisdiction has, that it makes sense to
21 use that.

22 That's one -- if you recall back from the
23 beginning of the ARAR discussion there's "applicable",
24 "relevant and appropriate," and "to be considered." So
25 that's a legal distinction within this process.

1 So that's our position. We're requesting that the
2 Organic Act be applicable as relevant and appropriate
3 within Area B.

4 With respect to the Area A MOA, we believe that
5 it actually talks to substantive issues not just
6 procedural issues. It specifies such things as minimum
7 remedies for sites. And we're requesting that for sites
8 that are discussed or talked about in the Area A MOA --
9 and those would be Area A sites and a certain list
10 that's included in the Area A MOA of Area B sites --
11 those sites which within the agreement the Park Service
12 has some concurrence on remedy selection, with Fill Site
13 5 being one of those Area B sites where Park Service has
14 concurrence.

15 For those sites, that Area A MOA be considered
16 a Crelevant and appropriateO ARAR; and we believe that's
17 important because of the minimum remedies. We wouldn't
18 be having this discussion with the Trust if it wasn't
19 for the Area A MOA. And so we feel that it does make an
20 important distinction here. The Trust has acknowledged
21 that they will still follow the Area A MOA, even if it's
22 not an ARAR, which is good, but in this process if
23 they're going to follow it anyway it seems that it being
24 an ARAR does make sense. And it is why we are having
25 these discussions.

1 Now, there's more to the details of the laws
2 and the positions the Park Service has taken than what I
3 just said. That I believe is what becomes a reasonable
4 condensed version.

5 MR. SUTTER: Is it these two issues that are
6 currently being kicked upstairs and being considered --

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: We made some progress. We
8 talked about the GMPA, which was an issue. We have
9 agreed to a compromise on that. As of the last RAB
10 meeting there were a number of language differences on a
11 variety of different ARARs. Those have been, I believe,
12 fully resolved; if not fully resolved almost fully
13 resolved. We have had meetings between Brian O'Neill
14 and Craig Middleton as well as Craig and myself have had
15 follow-up meetings to try to work through the direction
16 we've been given. So we have been making progress over
17 the last weeks since the last RAB meeting.

18 MR. SUTTER: But there's still decisions on
19 these that have to be made by the park superintendent
20 and the acting director of the Trust.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's correct. At least for
22 the park superintendent, it's his position that we will
23 be able to reach agreement on this. And the guidance
24 that he has given me is that these are very important
25 ARARs for the Park Service but that I'm to work with

1 Craig to try to work it out. And Brian O'Neill and
2 Craig Middleton will meet again as necessary to resolve
3 these.

4 MR. COOPER: I think I really don't have any
5 disagreement with the way Brian presented it. That's
6 exactly the way that he's been presenting it to the
7 Trust. I think our position, because we are the lead
8 agency, first of all, and we are signing up to the RAPS,
9 so we're going to be legally responsible for compliance
10 with all these laws.

11 What we are doing is basically having an
12 interpretation problem of what is an ARAR. Do those
13 particular laws follow this EPA guidance out on what
14 qualifies to be an ARAR and what isn't?
15 We need to have a working relationship with the Park
16 Service, so we put together in the spirit of compromise
17 for Area A, basically, we've agreed to list all these
18 additional laws and requirements that the Park Service
19 requested, because that was their jurisdiction and we
20 needed to be respectful of that, even though we feel by
21 definition the Area A MOA and some of these other ARARs
22 wouldn't meet the strict definition of the EPA guidance
23 on what an ARAR is, but in the spirit of compromise we
24 agreed to those.

25 But on Area B, also in the spirit of

1 the bottom, do some groundwater monitoring, and set up
2 erosion controls and revegetate.

3 So we want to make sure is, do we have all the
4 laws in place that will guide those activities? And we
5 feel that our proposal does that. It does have an
6 adequate list of all the laws to make sure that those
7 activities -- the excavation, the soil confirmation
8 sampling, revegetation, interim erosion controls,
9 groundwater monitoring -- we feel like our package of
10 ARARs provides the appropriate guidance to make sure we
11 do the right thing.

12 MR. NELSON: Craig, you didn't mention that
13 during the implementation of that actually we have
14 agreed to a number of ARARs that also protect resources
15 which are concerns of both the Trust and the Park
16 Service, so there are additional laws and requirements
17 that we will meet that essentially make sure that we're
18 not going to drive over an endangered species or fill in
19 a wetland or any of those sorts of things in the
20 implementation of our actions.

21 MR. COOPER: Right. Yeah.

22 FACILITATOR KERN: I saw a whole series of
23 hands. I saw David first and Peter and Jim.

24 MR. SUTTER: There's one thing I'm missing --
25 what's the bottom line that's involved here? Are we

1 compromise, we did agree to list several of the Park
2 Service management policies, the GGNRA, and, for
3 example, the Trust Act to basically give the Park
4 Service to try to address the heart of some of their
5 concerns that we're going to make sure that we do the
6 right thing, but where we are drawing a line is listing
7 the Area A MOA and the Organic Act as ARARs for our Area
8 B sites.

9 And we feel that is just above and beyond the
10 call of duty. They don't meet the definitions for
11 ARARs, in our opinion, in any of the remediation sites.
12 And we feel that the package we're putting together for
13 Area A and Area B sites should give the Park Service
14 good enough confidence that things are going to be done
15 appropriately. And I think that's what's important.
16 So I can go into more detail. Again, like Brian, I'm
17 not an attorney.

18 There are more complicated reasons about where
19 we drew the line and why. I don't know if you want to
20 go into that, but I think this is very important to us
21 too, but we just pretty much reached a point where we
22 feel we've got a good enough laundry list to make sure
23 that -- for example, at Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, what
24 we are going to do is excavate waste and haul it off
25 site. We are going to take soil confirmation samples at

1 talking about big bucks between the Trust's and the Park
2 Service's positions here as to what's done in the level
3 of the cleanup, the standards, et cetera? Or is the
4 issue really one of legal precedent? Is the dispute
5 being driven by the lawyers involved? Or how do those
6 two factors interact? Let me complicate the question a
7 little bit further.

8 MR. COOPER: Do you want to answer that?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can begin to address it,
10 because I think there's some of both going on. And I
11 think that there's some principle involved; there's
12 definitely some precedent involved, because this is the
13 first decision. And these sites will basically work it
14 out for all the other sites coming forth.
15 I think the dollar issue -- it comes essentially very
16 close if not all way to the point of agreeing. I think
17 that the issue of dollars is most possible if things go
18 poorly -- if the site has problems. If things go well,
19 I don't know if these would actually make any impact.

20 I think that both sides are probably fearful of
21 something not going correctly and trying to guard
22 against those potentialities. I'm not sure that I can
23 fully even give you good examples of that, and I want to
24 bring in our attorneys to help work through that. I
25 feel comfortable at least from the Park Service that

1 this decision is not being driven by the attorneys.

2 MR. COOPER: I feel the same. I talked to my
3 attorneys about it, and then we briefed Craig Middleton.
4 And we really let him make the final call.
5 I think it's important, as Brian said, that Brian
6 O'Neill and Craig Middleton will meet again hopefully
7 very soon and finish this issue off. Brian Ullensvang
8 and I were talking about how it's tough for them because
9 they have such large responsibilities -- both of those
10 individuals have far-reaching responsibilities.

11 And to be able to educate them on such a
12 detailed, specific issue of all the other issues they
13 talk about and for those two to sit down and have a
14 logical debate about it is difficult, because they don't
15 know a lot of the details about ARARs and what's
16 important and what isn't. We've briefed them -- and
17 probably will have to again -- so they can sit down and
18 resolve it.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Much like you all have had to
20 struggle with the language of ARARs and the very
21 specific vocabulary that is embedded within the
22 concepts, our managers are in that same boat, where in
23 order to be able to express their viewpoints, they were
24 having to learn the language such that their thought is
25 communicated in a way that everyone can agree on and

1 what it means. And that's difficult.

2 MR. O'HARA: We've been at this, as you know,
3 since 1994. And I've spent a lot of time at this table,
4 as have you and Doug. And it's very frustrating to come
5 down to almost there but not quite. At the last meeting
6 I recall Chris talking about the celebration at the
7 final final, when this issue gets finally put to bed.
8 That was 30 days ago that I think we had talked about
9 putting this entire matter to bed, hopefully by this
10 meeting. My assumption is that you'd like to have it
11 off the table by next meeting, but if it doesn't this
12 thing can go on forever.

13 And in the meantime there's a lot of talk about
14 implementation, but we just don't get there. If you
15 take a look at the status updates, everything appears to
16 be hinging on the language of agreement, which you don't
17 seem to be able to get done.

18 And I think from the perspective of the mandate
19 of the community members of the RAB, we're the
20 Restoration Advisory Board and advising not only the
21 regulators but we have a responsibility to the public,
22 because this is the taxpayer that's footing the bill on
23 this. And the longer this goes on the more expensive
24 it's going to get.

25 What I'd like -- and I think I'm speaking for

1 my colleagues here -- is that you put a date on when you
2 will have either an agreement on the ARARs or an
3 agreement to go to arbitration. And I know you don't
4 want to go to arbitration, but I think that at some
5 point you're going to have to agree to go to
6 arbitration, or the public has really got to be informed
7 what's going on here.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Let me suggest an alternate
9 language and tell you why I suggest that. I'm not
10 disagreeing with you, but just trying to make sure that
11 we're talking in words that are similar.
12 When you suggest arbitration, in our Area A MOA, we have
13 a process to resolve disputes -- dispute resolution --
14 and it has a step-wise series of moving forward.

15 The Park Service doesn't believe they're at
16 that point where we have reached an impasse and we need
17 to do that. I believe -- and please correct me if I'm
18 wrong -- but the Trust feels we are much closer to that
19 impasse and we may be at that point. It's our opinion
20 that if we were to go to dispute resolution now it would
21 actually slow down the resolution of this issue.

22 We think we can reach agreement, and our
23 superintendent feels comfortable that there are ways to
24 get to an answer on those problems that we still need to
25 explore, that we would be much more efficient than if we

1 were to take the diametrically opposed processes that
2 are inherent in dispute resolution where you divert
3 putting your position on paper and elevating it to
4 successive levels to higher authorities. And it may
5 come to that. But we think that right now we are still
6 making progress.

7 Now as far as a date certain I can't commit the
8 Park Service to a date certain without consulting with
9 Brian. And we can certainly raise that issue to him, if
10 that's where the Board would like to go, and have him
11 suggest a date or determine what he would feel
12 comfortable agreeing to, but that's fair.

13 MR. O'HARA: I'm not suggesting, Brian, that
14 you agree or don't agree to a date specific. I think if
15 you are as confident as you are that the issue can be
16 resolved and you feel that the issue can be resolved, I
17 would like you to give me -- is it three days? Is it
18 sixty days? But at some point I think the Board is
19 going to say after X period of time if you don't take it
20 to dispute resolution the Board has no confidence that
21 it's ever going to get resolved on a timely basis and
22 that we have to take it to the public.

23 MR. COOPER: I think the Trust feels the same
24 way basically. We definitely want to give one more shot
25 with a Craig Middleton and Brian O'Neill "summit," let's

Page 61

1 call it. And we are happy that it can be worked out for
2 that. But if it doesn't, then that's why we write
3 dispute resolution sections into settlement agreements.
4 Yes, they can be cumbersome; they can be lengthy. There
5 are ways to fast-track the process, but we need to find
6 a way out of this.

7 And I think sometimes both parties with very
8 good intentions just cannot agree. And that's why you
9 bounce it up to someone else to decide for you. Now, I
10 can't commit to a date on which formal dispute
11 resolution would be invoked either. That's not
12 something for me personally to decide, but we can commit
13 to maybe designating a point of contact for the RAB and
14 once the Craig Middleton-Brian O'Neill summit is set we
15 can tell them that date and kind of like what we did
16 before -- try to keep you informed in a timely basis. I
17 know you're very frustrated on this and you want to be
18 kept informed on what's going on. And we are aware that
19 time is slipping away.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: One think I'd like to offer
21 is that the group not focus exclusively on the ARARs
22 issue. Craig says a "summit." I'm not convinced that
23 the day after the decision is made that things will
24 suddenly appear in your lap. I think we need to look at
25 what the overall timeline is and see where other things

Page 62

1 can be done to help mitigate some of the scheduling
2 damage that's being done by this issue.

3 And that in a sort of timelines of events,
4 maybe there are things that can be done to compensate
5 for what's going on right now. Not that what's going on
6 right now is a good thing. I agree with you that this
7 is not where we should be. And it is somewhat
8 embarrassing to be talking about this nearly two years
9 after the Park Service first brought up the ARARs with
10 the Trust. I'm not sitting here saying it's a good
11 thing.

12 MR. O'HARA: I'm not suggesting that the RAB
13 is trying to dictate anything. These are your issues.
14 You've got to get them resolved. You've got an approach
15 to it; the Trust has got an approach to it. Both from
16 your perspective viewpoints are very valid, but there's
17 a responsibility to the public.

18 And ultimately I don't think that the public
19 really cares. They want action. They don't care whose
20 budget it comes out of. They don't care whose egos are
21 bruised. They want action, because they are paying for
22 it. And they're entitled to results. So I'm suggesting
23 -- and what I'm throwing out for further discussion --
24 that if the matter is not resolved by the next RAB
25 meeting, that you either agree to take it to dispute

Page 63

1 resolution or RAB will take it public.

2 MR. COOPER: Okay. We got it.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: I want to take a little
4 time to come back to your idea.
5 And also Jerry had a thought -- was it along these
6 lines?

7 MR. ANDERSON: No. You said that you didn't
8 want to accept the Park Service's recommendations
9 because they weren't in the nature of an appropriate or
10 reasonable ARAR. What is there about the definition of
11 ARARs that makes them inappropriate?

12 MR. COOPER: Sure. From our perspective,
13 ARARs need to be state or federal environmental laws --
14 promulgated laws. And we see the Area A MOA -- by the
15 way we don't that as a promulgated state or federal law.
16 We see that as a settlement document that of course we
17 are going to comply with, but we don't see that as
18 meeting the definition for an ARAR; for example, at all
19 my time working on Superfund sites at EPA, I had consent
20 decrees and orders and all kinds of settlement
21 agreements with PRPs and other agencies on my Superfund
22 work.

23 Those definitely had their place. They never
24 made it to an ARARs table. And I know the Park Service
25 has a different perspective on that, but I just wanted

Page 64

1 to give you my perspective on how we see the Area A
2 ARARs. We definitely need to comply with it and --

3 MR. ANDERSON: And that complies with that one
4 item?

5 MR. COOPER: And then for the Organic Act, you
6 mean?

7 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

8 MR. COOPER: For that one it is a promulgated
9 federal law, but we don't see it as -- I identified the
10 actions that we would be undertaking for our work
11 excavation of waste, confirmation sampling, groundwater
12 monitors, et cetera. We don't see those actions
13 triggering that particular law.

14 We do this work, we take a look at what laws
15 will we be up against -- the Clean Water Act, and the
16 Safe Drinking Water Act, and RCRA, the solid waste laws,
17 and things like that. We don't see the Organic Act as a
18 particular law that we believe is triggered or has any
19 relevance to the remediation work that we are doing.
20 And the Park Service feels differently, and we have
21 tried to come half way to meet the Park Service on their
22 concerns. That's our position.

23 MR. SUTTER: And presumably the legal language
24 is not that clear to support either your position
25 unequivocally or the Park Service position

1 unequivocably?

2 MR. COOPER: Unequivocably? Correct. If you
3 look at EPA guidance, it doesn't say.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would suggest that the two
5 are different. The Area 2 MOA is a unique item for this
6 project. It's only specific to the Presidio. The
7 Organic Act, the Park Service has guidance on ARARs.
8 They are used for cleanups in parks throughout the
9 country.

10 And that guidance will talk about the Organic
11 Act as being an ARAR. And it does talk about is being
12 relevant and appropriate on lands that are similar to or
13 managed in a way which might include land adjacent to a
14 park, which has land and habitat that have qualities
15 that are very similar to the park.

16 So in that case it does bring up as relevant
17 and appropriate, so in that case we feel pretty strongly
18 that this is not a unique piece, but the Trust is unique
19 here but that the land that the Trust manages is very
20 similar to and is part of the park that we are within.
21 And in that regard we think that the site-specific
22 issues are less relevant. It's more of something that
23 has a national precedent to it. And, for example, at
24 Ft. Baker just across the Bay, the Army included the
25 Organic Act as an ARAR for work that they did there.

1 MR. ANDERSON: What's the downside to the
2 Trust in accepting that?

3 MR. COOPER: In accepting the --

4 MR. ANDERSON: Maybe you wouldn't have chosen
5 that as one of the laws, but if people feel strongly
6 that it should be, so what? Do you care?

7 MR. COOPER: We feel like we have already
8 strayed -- we need to follow the process.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Why do you care?

10 MR. COOPER: Because the CERCLA process is
11 important to us. And if we just start not following the
12 CERCLA process, that's not good precedent.

13 MR. ANDERSON: It's not a matter of following
14 precedence; it's just deciding your judgment or somebody
15 else's judgment as to what fulfills it.

16 MR. COOPER: Right. And in our judgment we
17 are there. We've done it. We have put everything
18 that's important in our ARARs table.

19 MR. ANDERSON: How do you get hurt if you put
20 another one in?

21 MR. NELSON: Well, the Trust has its own act
22 created by Congress and the act of Congress created the
23 Trust and also laid out the area where the Trust has its
24 activities; therefore, we have laws and regulations that
25 we have established or that have been established for us

1 that we operate under. So, therefore, shouldn't those
2 be applicable and take precedence over another agency's
3 jurisdiction outside of our boundaries?

4 MR. COOPER: I guess you could say that about
5 any law. Why don't we just dump that in also.

6 MS. YARROS: You said why not apply that to
7 any law. Usually a law is formulated because it
8 prevents harm to someone or something. There is danger
9 in doing it the other way, but as Jerry said and

10 actually I was forming the same question: Are you
11 intent on doing only what you have to do? What does it
12 hurt to go a step farther? What beauty is there or what
13 grace or what advantage is there in only doing it just
14 because you are only complying to the federal or state
15 law or -- what's the other term you used -- that's a
16 settlement document. What's wrong with the settlement
17 document?

18 In fact I was going to ask before: Could you
19 tell us specifically what things you don't want to do?
20 You start out by saying the things you have agreed to
21 do. You were answering Brian by saying that you had
22 agreed to monitoring. What specific things are you not
23 agreeing to do cover these things --

24 MR. COOPER: As far as remedy work, I don't
25 think there's any disagreement whatsoever. And Brian,

1 correct me if I'm wrong, as far as how we are going to
2 implement the remedy, the contents of the work plans --
3 there's no disagreement there.

4 That's why I feel that the universe of ARARs that we've
5 already identified provides adequate guidance to put
6 together all our work plans to make sure we do the right
7 thing

8 MS. YARROS: So the only part that you're
9 disagreeing with is this settlement agreement?

10 MR. COOPER: Again, I'm not an attorney, but
11 we feel that we've already reached out and brought in an
12 adequate universe of ARARs to guide us to make sure
13 we've done the right thing. And there's no reason to
14 add layers upon layers of extra requirements upon us.

15 MR. HERMANN: Maybe that's the wrong perception.

16 MS. YARROS: I don't understand why, other
17 than the fact that you're intent on doing only what you
18 absolutely have to do -- kind of a default position -- a
19 very negative attitude it seems to me to only do what
20 you have to do. And certainly this group would not feel
21 that way -- that's why we're here. We want it to be as
22 good as it can be, not at a bare minimum.

23 MR. COOPER: I don't think our universe of
24 ARARs is the bare minimum at all. I think we have
25 already gone above and beyond the call of duty in

1 listing ARARs. If we really wanted to do the bare
2 minimum ARARs, we could pare back a little -- quite a
3 bit. We've already added several ARARs to meet the Park
4 Service halfway, so if I characterized it as doing the
5 bare minimum I didn't mean to. I think we are going
6 well beyond.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: There's a few hands that
8 have come up, and I want to get them in the order I've
9 seen them raised. Thank you for keeping these reasonably
10 in some order. I think we're doing a good job here.

11 MS. WRIGHT: I have a small pile of questions,
12 so I'll try to keep them simple. I have to say I think
13 I would like to share your commitment that this will
14 come to some sort of an understanding soon, but
15 listening to the dialogue it doesn't seem to indicate
16 that, although that may come soon, where the two will
17 sit down for the summit. But the date isn't set, and it
18 sounds like there are quite a lot of areas of
19 disagreement. So I'd like to know first of all can you
20 give us some reason to share your optimism? What makes
21 you confident this time that there will be an agreement
22 reached?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Well, I take exception to the
24 "summit" concept, but I believe it's more a series of
25 conversations. As we had talked about at the last RAB

1 lands for future generation?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's part of the mission of
3 the Park Service. It was established as part of the
4 establishing legislation in 1916, and it is one of our
5 fundamental laws that we work with.

6 MR. PONTON: Its goal is preservation?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's preservation. It talks
8 about leaving the resources available for future
9 generations; it's some of the very mission of the Park
10 Service.

11 MR. PONTON: Isn't that fundamentally at odds
12 with the Presidio's mission statement to become
13 financially self-sufficient by 2013 and develop
14 property, and aren't those two opposed just in
15 fundamental principle?

16 MR. NELSON: No, because the Presidio Trust's
17 enabling legislation discusses not developing the
18 Presidio but maintaining the Presidio as a national park
19 that pays for itself through maintaining its historic
20 landmark status. In other words, we're not going to
21 just willy-nilly tear down buildings.

22 We're going to comply with the National
23 Historic Protection Act and also the general principles
24 of the general management plan which is set forth by the
25 Park Service. So there is a discussion of maintaining

1 meeting, there was a meeting among several people but
2 primarily between Brian O'Neill and Craig Middleton the
3 first of March. That led to a meeting that Craig and I
4 had the following week, on Friday the eighth, where we
5 spent several hours working through details and making
6 progress.

7 The Trust has as of today offered some
8 language; and with that offer, Craig Middleton called
9 Brian O'Neill. That call is pending; Brian intends to
10 return the call tomorrow. So that as opposed to a fixed
11 summit, there's a series of events which I see, the same
12 as Craig. We're just characterizing it differently.
13 I'm seeing it as more of a fluid process which is
14 continuing. And as each step has transpired, I believe
15 we are closer to the end.

16 So we're still proceeding and homing in on a
17 conclusion. And there appear to be many options
18 available of how we could get to an end. We may even
19 agree to disagree, and there may be ways to do that. So
20 even if they don't arm wrestle and one of them cries,
21 "Uncle," I think there are ways to either agree or get
22 past this disagreement which won't require the whole
23 process to spin out of control.

24 MR. PONTON: I've never really heard of the
25 Organic Act before. You said its goal is to preserve

1 the Presidio as a national treasure for future
2 generations

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: When we think of important
4 resources in the Park it's more than natural resources.
5 There's a variety of both natural and historical
6 resources. Sometimes those resources are at odds with
7 each other. It's part of the joy of working in a
8 complicated park and trying to work toward balancing so
9 the contradictory resources are not impaired for future
10 generations. And it is difficult. And the Trust has
11 the added burden of become self-sufficient within those
12 issues, but it's not inherently contradictory.

13 MR. PONTON: So it doesn't limit what the
14 Trust can do in the future in terms of development or --

15 MR. COOPER: No. Again, this would only be
16 applied to remediation sites. And we think that the
17 ARARs that we have listed present that clear vision for
18 what we plan on doing in the future and to protect the
19 resources, et cetera, et cetera, at our remediation
20 sites.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Within national parks, there
22 are developments that occur -- new visitor centers are
23 built in certain parks. It doesn't mean that you can't
24 do anything to be consistent with the Organic Act.
25 There are ways to promote the visitation and enjoyment

1 of resources and allowing future generations to have
2 those resources through some proper development.
3 MR. NELSON: Crissy Field is a great example.
4 You have a mixture of a built environment with the East
5 Beach. You have the very manicured-looking dune-form
6 landscapes and rows of trees. You have the Crissy Field
7 Center and the Warming Hut, and at the same time you
8 have walkways through protected areas of dune sand and
9 endangered and threatened species. And the marsh itself
10 is used by a variety of waterfowl and other birds.

11 Crissy Field is sort of a great example of how
12 the Presidio works. It's a built environment next to
13 the natural environment that's working well together and
14 the Park Service was not hindered by having to protect
15 resources in having to make decisions about how they
16 were going to develop Crissy Field. They wanted it to
17 be an urban park for everyone to come and enjoy the
18 natural resources that are on display.

19 MR. O'HARA: Craig said something, and I
20 thought I saw Brian shake his head "yes" in agreement
21 with it; and that is basically the elements of the
22 cleanup, regardless of what ARARs are in place, is the
23 same. So that, in answer to Gloria's question and to
24 Jerry's, is from the public's standpoint. Who cares
25 what laws are in place as long as the cleanup gets done?

1 And you're basically agreeing that the method
2 of cleanup is the same. And I think that's what my
3 frustration is, because that's what I understood is that
4 it's whether there's a cleanup and a method for doing it
5 and all of the governing issues about how it will be
6 done. You've got agreement on this. The laws that go
7 into your agreeing to get the cleanup done is where you
8 have a disagreement.

9 And with all due respect I don't think it
10 really makes that much difference to the public as long
11 as it gets cleaned up. That's what the frustration is.
12 Sit down, get this thing hashed out, get an agreement,
13 or go to your dispute resolution.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think -- if I can suggest
15 -- I think that I share some of your frustration, but I
16 believe if we can look at three different
17 representatives here. As you were talking, you were
18 representing the public point of view; and Craig is
19 representing the Trust as an agency; and I represent the
20 Park Service as an agency. I believe each of the groups
21 is looking to protect the public and we're each looking
22 at it from a slightly different angle. And so we're all
23 trying to do the same thing. And it's frustrating that
24 we're not doing it. But I think with that common goal I
25 feel comfortable that we will be able to protect the

1 public.

2 In some ways it's a slightly different time
3 frame, it's a slightly different risk aversion and
4 scenarios that might be looked at. But I feel
5 comfortable with generally common goals we should be
6 able to find a solution to get there. And it may take
7 days or weeks, but it's there to be obtained. And
8 whether it takes an avenue through dispute resolution or
9 it can be resolved short of that, I'm comfortable that
10 we will get there without significant additional delay.

11 MR. O'HARA: But that's relative. I think
12 this body has a responsibility to make sure that that
13 gets done sooner rather than later.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think by discussions like
15 tonight two things will happen. Chris's management and
16 my management will know about this meeting, I'm sure,
17 before tomorrow. And at least within the Park Service
18 -- and I'm sure the same for the Trust, but I just want
19 to speak firsthand -- my management listens very
20 carefully to the voice of the public and weighs that
21 very heavily in the decision-making process.
22 So this lengthy discussion will definitely have value to
23 Brian O'Neill.

24 And so I believe it is productive. And I also
25 think that it's very important that this provides a very

1 important education opportunity for everyone here as we
2 all learn this common language of ARARs and that as we
3 become familiar and comfortable with the vocabulary, you
4 very articulately express your true desires, which is
5 hard if you don't know the words. I hope that everyone
6 here is learning the right words so that, as you were
7 doing quite eloquently, you can express your viewpoints
8 of what really is important, because this is an
9 advisory-type forum.

10 FACILITATOR KERN: Let me run down the list so
11 those of you who are flailing your hand know where you
12 stand.

13 MR. HERMANN: I'm a new member but I sense the
14 same frustration that Peter has been talking about. A
15 brief analogy: If we were an investor group, we would
16 say, "Resolve the conflict. That's it." We are an
17 investor; we are the public; that is our investment.

18 Resolve the conflict. I don't want to hear
19 about you guys with these words and those words and so
20 forth. Just get it done. Come back to with us and tell
21 us how you did it. We might say, "That's really a bad
22 idea." But let's move.

23 MS. YARROS: With all respect to Craig, who
24 is sitting in the hot seat tonight, my question is along
25 the lines of Joel's and Jerry's. Is the language so

Page 77

1 important to keep you from reaching this agreement, that
2 it's this particular law that you will follow and not
3 that particular agreement? Brian just said that he
4 thinks both groups are interested in the public good and
5 to protect the public. I understand that the Park
6 Service's interest is to give us a clean park for us to
7 preserve it for posterity for future generations.

8 Can you tell us what angle the Trust has in
9 protection of the public? Is it money? Is it tax
10 dollars? And if it is that, then isn't that where we're
11 starting to get into trouble? Isn't the Trust starting
12 to get political there? If it's not tax dollars, what
13 is your take on the protection of the public?

14 MR. COOPER: Our remediation program is
15 basically guided by two laws -- CERCLA and Section 6.A
16 of the Health and Safety Code. Those laws in and of
17 themselves, throughout, talk about protection of the
18 public health and the environment. That's what the laws
19 are really about, and those are the laws that we are
20 foremost complying with.

21 If you comply with CERCLA and Section 6.A of
22 the Health and Safety Code, you're protecting the public
23 health and environment. And that's why we want to do a
24 really good job in implementing CERCLA and complying
25 with state law.

Page 78

1 As far as who's the arbitrator and who's
2 protecting the public health, it's DTSC and the Regional
3 Board. They're the protectors of public health and
4 they'll make sure if what the Trust proposes, either in
5 our remediation work or in our ARARs analysis, they will
6 be the first ones to speak up and say that's not
7 protecting the public health. And they'll make sure and
8 keep us in line on that.

9 MS. YAROS: Assuming you go to that next
10 step, what's wrong with complying with CERCLA? It's not
11 that you're not complying with CERCLA; it's just going
12 that extra inch or mile or whatever it is.

13 MR. COOPER: I can only give you the same
14 answer. We feel like we already have by the list of
15 these extra ARARs that we've already put on table.

16 MS. YAROS: What's wrong with the extra
17 \$500,000 or million or whatever it is?

18 MR. NELSON: I don't think it's the money.

19 MR. COOPER: We feel that there's no added
20 benefit. It's not going to make the project more safe,
21 more protective of the environment. There's no added
22 benefit.

23 MR. HERMANN: Yes, there is the benefit of
24 making an agency you're working with happy in the
25 relationship. There's a benefit, instead of going like

Page 79

1 this [indicating] forever.

2 MR. COOPER: Again, Area B, that's where the
3 Trust has jurisdiction and so we are following our
4 mandate. We thought it was a fair compromise.

5 MR. ANDERSON: But you don't have a mandate to
6 reject this.

7 FACILITATOR KERN: One at a time, please.

8 MR. COOPER: Just to follow through -- so we
9 are following our mandate in Area B -- the Trust Act --
10 and we are willing to follow the Park Service's mandate
11 in Area A. We thought that was a really fair
12 compromise; and it can be flipped back to them. Why
13 isn't that a fair deal?

14 MR. ANDERSON: If you're asking me, I just
15 fail to hear anything in these words that gives a
16 downside for a compromise.

17 MR. CALLANAN: I guess I don't share the
18 optimism, from what we've heard tonight, that this is
19 going to be settled very quickly. So I have a question
20 about when it goes to arbitration or dispute resolution.
21 And then who would be deciding the question? And then
22 do they have a time limit they have to make the
23 decision?

24 FACILITATOR KERN: What is the process?

25 MR. COOPER: I think either party can invoke

Page 80

1 the dispute resolution at any time.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a very specified
3 process, giving the exact time frames, providing for
4 procedures to modify those time frames if appropriate
5 and it starts -- and I'm not sure that I have it from
6 memory. I don't have all the details -- and somebody
7 jump in if I'm way off base here -- but once it is
8 invoked, either party has an opportunity to do so at any
9 time on any issue.

10 The first step is staff resolution. And the
11 staff have a fixed period of time to come out of the
12 dispute resolute process. If that is unsuccessful, it
13 goes to a management level dispute. And there are
14 particular roles -- not individuals -- but I think it's
15 probably the park superintendent and there's a
16 counterpart at the Trust. If they are unable to resolve
17 it, it goes to an executive level, which would
18 undoubtedly be the Trust with the Board and I would
19 presume somebody from the Department of the Interior or
20 the Director of the Park Service. That's specified in
21 our agreement.

22 If resolution is unable to be resolved there I
23 believe it goes to the Department of Justice or the
24 Attorney-General's office for ultimate resolution. They
25 make the decision. Each of those steps has a timeline;

1 and those are generally one to four weeks, so they are
2 prompt. The only one that does not have a timeline is
3 the last one because neither of our agencies is able to
4 bind a third agency that is not a party to the
5 disagreement.

6 The agreement does talk about time being of the
7 essence and similar things that will go with the package
8 that goes into that agency. There will be some
9 discussion of the importance the time has on the
10 resolution of the issue.

11 In each of steps there's a transmittal of the
12 bindings or issues that were dealt with at the previous
13 level and the written record that goes along with the
14 dispute as it moves up the chain. So that's the
15 process. And I'm sorry I can't recall the exact
16 timeline, but that's the general timeline.

17 MR. CALLANAN: Has that resolution procedure
18 been used at other bases?

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: There are very similar
20 procedures at other similar situations. There is a very
21 unique situation between the Trust and the Park Service,
22 but our agreement for dispute resolution was patterned
23 after the dispute resolution processes that were
24 contained in other analogous agreements. I've actually
25 never experienced a formal dispute resolution process,

1 ARARs are not adopted?

2 I feel like we've talked about that tonight,
3 but do you have any concrete examples of something,
4 either what's your worst fear that could happen if the
5 ARARs are not adopted?
6 And on the other side what if they are, and what is the
7 worst that would happen?

8 MR. COOPER: Well, that is a very difficult
9 question to answer. My attorneys and Craig Middleton
10 -- we made a decision as a group that that we had a fair
11 program and adding these particular ARARs were not
12 consistent with the way the Trust felt it wanted the
13 remediation program to go. We have a partnership with
14 the Park Service and we feel that this splitting of the
15 ARARs, the way we've developed it, sets up the
16 appropriate roles in this partnership of Area A versus
17 Area B; and that's important to us.

18 Congress set it up that way and we want to
19 follow through on that spirit. And so applying laws
20 that aren't appropriate in area B -- I guess if you're
21 an attorney you can go through a whole laundry list of
22 worst-case scenarios of a slippery slope and I'm not an
23 attorney. I really can't opine any further on that, but
24 it's -- I'll just leave it at that.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: If I could, I beg not to give

1 but I'm sure they been done somewhere.

2 Maybe, Bob or Craig, do you know of one that's
3 been through the dispute resolution process that's
4 survived it.

5 MR. COOPER: I have never been in formal
6 dispute resolution. I've been to this point with other
7 parties on the verge of invoking dispute resolution.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's been my opinion that
9 dispute resolution is a very difficult process, and the
10 threat of it is usually enough to resolve the issue.
11 It's a Cold War-type tactic. You don't want to go
12 through it, so you try very hard not to.

13 MR. CALLANAN: Sounds like we are pretty close
14 to it here.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: Probably as close as we've
16 been in this program. I think that we still have enough
17 room before we get there, but the Trust may feel that
18 we're closer to it than the Park Service does.

19 MS. WRIGHT: It sounds like both agencies are
20 feeling motivated to get this done. And I am more
21 convinced that something will happen this month. And
22 I'd like to assume that will move forward.

23 I'm not completely clear -- if this is too complicated a
24 question, then feel free to pass -- but I'm not clear if
25 I understand. What's the worst that can happen if these

1 a worst-case example. Again, not being versed as a
2 lawyer would be on the nuances, I think I can say that
3 our general concern is that things will either -- this
4 site or other sites, as mentioned earlier this evening,
5 has some precedents for other sites within the Presidio
6 -- that some unforeseen situation may occur where there
7 will come a choice which may not protect the resources
8 to the degree that we feel is appropriate.

9 MS. WRIGHT: I think that was kind of a
10 complicated question, but I do want to add I think we
11 should move along as quickly as possible. I agree with
12 my colleagues in that sense. I also think you guys have
13 some very important issues. I wish you luck in moving
14 forward with it, and that it's not because you feel
15 pressured, but I hope that you can come to some sort of
16 full understanding.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: These were sites that were
18 agreed upon to accelerate to move with the program and
19 actually demonstrate that remediation could occur here
20 and could occur in a timely manner, so I think that both
21 agencies are very motivated to demonstrate that the
22 program can move and that the basic concept of the
23 remedy at both these sites has not been the issue.
24 We're not disagreeing at all with the concept of
25 excavating these landfills or taking waste off the site.

1 And so I'll express my optimism to resolve this.
 2 MR. SUTTER: This has been a fascinating
 3 discussion. I'm glad to learn that there's really no
 4 dollar-and-cents issue involved here. Or if there is,
 5 it hasn't been fully articulated. But there certainly
 6 is a dollars-and-cents issue: The longer this is
 7 delayed, the more expensive the whole program becomes --
 8 overhead costs and everything else.

9 And since there doesn't seem to be disagreement
 10 on the actual work that's going to be done and
 11 presumably the level of ARAR work that the Park Service
 12 is asking be done is the same as the Trust is doing to
 13 do anyway, presumably that's all included in the \$100
 14 million budget.

15 It seems to me that what's been going on here
 16 is sort of a theological argument about how many ARARs
 17 you can fit on the head of a pin. And that's just
 18 absurd. I hate to say it, but that's really an absurd
 19 situation. There's no up side; there's no down side to
 20 doing it the Park Service's way as opposed to the
 21 Trust's way. There's no impact. So why the hell don't
 22 we get on with it? Is this just bureaucratic nitpicking
 23 that's going on here?

24 MR. HARRIS: I was going to suggest or at
 25 least ask a question. I hear the enthusiasm that you

1 portray. I'm also recognizing or at least feeling that
 2 you are opposed to arbitration. And from the length of
 3 the time that you discussed, I think that will put us
 4 back to almost square one.

5 So I guess there are two things I'd like to
 6 know: What is it that the two of you would like to have
 7 us do to help you move this process?
 8 I heard you also say that they -- both Craig and Brian
 9 -- will know about this meeting tomorrow. They will
 10 know it from word of mouth. Would it be of any value
 11 that this conversation was put into writing -- the
 12 frustration that we are feeling -- would that be helpful
 13 to you to present to your bosses? In other words, what
 14 can we do to help resolve this? Would writing help?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't believe that it would
 16 help. I don't believe it would hurt. If it makes
 17 members of the RAB feel more secure in that they're
 18 being heard, I believe that it would be fine to voice
 19 your concerns in whatever way you want. I feel
 20 comfortable that I can communicate the enthusiasm that
 21 the RAB has brought to the subject tonight to Brian
 22 O'Neill. And I will try not to soft-pedal at all the
 23 frustration that all of you are sharing tonight, but I
 24 always don't want to discourage you from voicing your
 25 opinions directly, however you would like to do that.

1 MR. COOPER: I completely agree with what
 2 Brian has said.

3 MR. HARRIS: So you have no objection to what
 4 we as a group could do to help move the process along.

5 MR. COOPER: I think a letter can't hurt. In
 6 fact, I recommend it if that's what you want to do.
 7 Please do so. Brian and I can give you fax numbers for
 8 Craig Middleton and Brian O'Neill just to make sure.
 9 The actual meeting date hasn't been set yet. We hope to
 10 have it later this week. If they got a letter from you
 11 guys saying how important this is, maybe if there was a
 12 schedule conflict, they might say let's put this aside
 13 so that they can be sure we have this meeting this week.
 14 It might get down to practical day-to-day stuff like
 15 that

16 MS. CHEEVER: I was just noticing that almost
 17 everyone has said something. Briefly, I don't feel like
 18 I completely understand all of the nuances, but I know
 19 that I and people that I know and maybe those who might
 20 be represented here do care very much about preserving
 21 the Park -- not just the Presidio but other parks --
 22 and preserving park resources.

23 And while at the same time I share everyone's
 24 eagerness to have something resolved quickly, I also
 25 don't think that that's the only goal. I also have the

1 goal of preserving park resources. I just want to say
 2 that I respect that aspect of the Park Service's
 3 position.

4 MR. COOPER: And I would like to add that the
 5 Presidio Trust Act speaks to that issue. And we have
 6 also listed, for example, we have our vision for how we
 7 are going to revegetate both Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.
 8 And we are basically setting precedents for all areas
 9 that will be consistent with our vegetation management
 10 plan, which is a plan that both the Trust and the Park
 11 Service worked on together as a team. And that is how
 12 we're going to protect Park resources at our remediation
 13 sites -- with the vegetation management plan and the
 14 Trust Act in Area B. And it's very important to us
 15 also.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: My question has to do with
 17 precedent. And maybe it's to all of the regulators here
 18 -- about how adding additional things beyond the
 19 restrictive environmental law to an ARARs program --
 20 does that affect future RAPs and future sites where
 21 there are ARARs established so that you would end up
 22 with local laws or resolutions or other sorts of things
 23 all cobbled into ARARs areas making them muckier instead
 24 of cleaner in terms of the way the laws are organized?

25 MR. BOGGS: Well, you touched on a couple of

1 things there. In ARARs typically you want to identify
2 those laws that specifically speak to what we are doing.
3 There's a lot of laws like the Americans With
4 Disabilities act that potentially if we were going to do
5 something at one of these sites we've got to make it
6 wheelchair-accessible, but those laws under that act
7 really don't focus on what we're doing here as
8 restoration, so our agency sees that there's a minimum
9 number of laws that need to be addressed when you're
10 doing these actions.

11 And there's a lot of these additional laws like
12 the Organic Act that may or may not have something
13 specific to do at a specific location that has to follow
14 a specific ARAR because it has to do with national
15 parks. We are not opposed to having more ARARs listed
16 than may be strictly applicable. This is part of where
17 the attorneys come in because they always break them
18 down and say this is applicable here. It expressly
19 directs what we're doing. Then they can say the Trust
20 over here isn't the Park Service over here.

21 But it's right next door and these critters and
22 these ecological habitats don't draw the same lines, so
23 the Organic Act would expand to areas that are similar
24 or continuous.

25 Then there's yet a third category to be

1 considered. And that's where the lawyers are going to
2 draw the nuances in that the Organic Act as a minimum
3 should be considered in whatever they do here, whether
4 it's applicable or relevant and appropriate, that's
5 where the nuances and the attorneys get involved. And
6 even though we don't list the Americans With
7 Disabilities Act, we fully expect that the Trust will
8 comply with these laws as if they were doing a project
9 that involved them.

10 Just because it's not listed in the ARARs table
11 does not mean that they don't have to comply with it.
12 And so at this point, we're hoping that this issue get
13 resolved as well. We don't think any of them are way
14 off track.

15 Additionally my management feels we don't need
16 to weigh in on this, but at this point it's still an
17 interim action and that actual final action on this does
18 not come until later. So at this point our agency says
19 if we're complying with it, they're not just going dig
20 it up and dump it into someone's back yard, if that is
21 one of the ARARs that we're concerned about. And the
22 Trust did list that one, so they're not going to do
23 that.

24 So for an interim action our nuances on that
25 language our attorneys aren't as concerned with. We're

1 getting that action done. Our direction at this
2 conference is not to focus on process so much as
3 product. We want to see more dirt getting moved. We
4 don't want to get caught in all the regulations and
5 bureaucracy and have the project be about the
6 bureaucracy. It's like, CWhy solve the problem when we
7 can study it for another year?O
8 So we are trying to get away from that and get more into
9 action.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: So my question goes back to the
11 public acceptance as part of the criteria for
12 environmental and things. And I think the public has
13 spoken tonight. They're ready to go.

14 MR. ANDERSON: The bottom line of this is that
15 we'd like to see Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 be removed
16 this construction season, right? So what's the date by
17 which this agreement has to happen to let that go ahead
18 this construction season? Is it 30 days from now? 60
19 days from now? 90 days from now? Is it something
20 that's critical right away?

21 MR. COOPER: I've have to check the master
22 schedule to see how it lays out, when our last possible
23 start day could be.

24 MR. ANDERSON: We'd really hate to miss that
25 date. If we could have an interim set of ARARs that

1 would allow this to go forward by that date, it would be
2 really nice.

3 FACILITATOR KERN: There were a couple of
4 outstanding issues. One is Peter's point of a
5 resolution of this situation by the next RAB meeting or
6 that the RAB would go public with that. And Willard's
7 idea of possibly a letter. Perhaps some of those ideas
8 could be incorporated together into this draft of a
9 letter that I might pass around, that I just happen to
10 have a copy of for your review. Perhaps we could weave
11 in -- I did get a comment that maybe we want to get our
12 action further up in the letter, rather than sort of the
13 history lesson which is the first paragraph.
14 But take a moment and read it if you like.

15 MR. O'HARA: I'd like to give Brian and
16 Craig the benefit of the doubt and extend it to the next
17 RAB meeting. But the one thing I'd like to do -- and we
18 talked about this afternoon -- I would suggest that the
19 only cc's on this letter go to Bob and Jim. And the
20 reason I'm saying that is because I want to preserve the
21 confidentiality of this and give the disputed parties an
22 opportunity to resolve this in-house.

23 I think that expanding it to the board of
24 directors or commissioners of the GGNRA or anybody else
25 other than in essence the people in this room and their

1 executives, let's preserve the integrity of this process
 2 in-house, so to speak,
 3 MR. HARRIS: Can you then mark the letter
 4 "confidential"?
 5 MR. O'HARA: It's been my experience that
 6 whenever we write a letter to somebody, there's three
 7 pages of cc's. It's kind of a shotgun approach to it.
 8 And Nancy Pelosi doesn't really need to know about this
 9 at this time.
 10 And what I'm suggesting is that we write the
 11 letter. And I think it says what we want to have
 12 happen. And our expectation is that it will happen by
 13 these specific dates. And it basically follows up on
 14 your suggestion that we try and facilitate or prompt the
 15 parties to get closer together by doing it in writing.
 16 There's nothing punitive about what we're suggesting
 17 here. So I think that we anticipated what you said and
 18 your suggestion, and this is the substance of that.
 19 MR. SUTTER: I would agree. I think that
 20 Peter's suggestion that the regular RAB meeting be the
 21 date that we look for their action on by the two parties
 22 at the top. And I think that's appropriate.
 23 FACILITATOR KERN: I've inserted April 8th for
 24 March 25th and April 9th for the next RAB meeting dates.
 25 MR. HARRIS: Wait a minute. March the 25th is

1 agree on this ultimately, aren't they?
 2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe so.
 3 MR. O'HARA: So why push the envelope if you
 4 don't have to? And then cc Bob and Jim.
 5 MS. YARROS: Okay.
 6 FACILITATOR KERN: Would it be appropriate to
 7 have you agree, as community co-chair, to sign this on
 8 behalf of RAB so we don't have to get all the
 9 signatures? Or do you want to list all the names? Or
 10 is that good enough?
 11 MR. O'HARA: I think that what we'd like would
 12 be a resolution to a motion for you and the two
 13 co-chairs to sign it for the RAB. May I make that
 14 motion?
 15 MR. PONTON: Craig's the other one.
 16 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I think if we have a vote
 17 to send this letter, it would add to the letter to say
 18 this letter was voted on by a vote of such and such at
 19 the RAB meeting.
 20 MR. ANDERSON: I agree. Can't we just do that
 21 rather than leaving it to sort of float along in limbo
 22 like other things?
 23 MS. CHEEVER: If we take Willard's suggestion
 24 about moving the second paragraph further up there,
 25 there has to be a little bit of a sentence of talking

1 what?
 2 FACILITATOR KERN: If a reasonable agreement
 3 cannot be achieved by April 8th, the day before the next
 4 RAB meeting. And then the RAB meeting will be April
 5 9th.
 6 MR. HARRIS: I would also agree with whoever
 7 suggested that the substance of what we're talking about
 8 be the first paragraph rather than the history, and that
 9 the history then fall in perhaps the second paragraph,
 10 because I think what we want to do is to say our
 11 statement up front, because they know the history
 12 already and then just inject the history in the middle
 13 portion of the letter and then with the closing.
 14 FACILITATOR KERN: Okay.
 15 MS. YARROS: I want to be sure I understand.
 16 Peter, you're not suggesting not even a cc to the
 17 Presidio Trust?
 18 MR. O'HARA: Well, it's being addressed to the
 19 Presidio Trust. I would suggest that the letter be kept
 20 to the individuals that are in this room and their
 21 superiors. I don't think it is an expression of our
 22 discontent, but I think that for the time being that the
 23 expression of our discontent need go no farther than
 24 Craig Middleton and Brian O'Neill. They're the first
 25 level of authority. They're the guys that are going to

1 about what we're concerned about. So if we have this
 2 vote, there would be a minor change that wouldn't change
 3 the substance of it.
 4 MR. O'HARA: With latitude for wordsmithing.
 5 MR. CALLANAN: I'll move that the letter be
 6 sent in accordance with Julia's suggestion about the
 7 introductory paragraph.
 8 MS. MONAGHAN: I second.
 9 FACILITATOR KERN: Discussion?
 10 MR. O'HARA: It would also include verbiage in
 11 here that the letter has been discussed and that a vote
 12 of the membership -- a motion -- was moved and approved
 13 to send the letter.
 14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think maybe we should have
 15 a show of hands.
 16 FACILITATOR KERN: The way the motion stands:
 17 We are going to move the paragraphs around. We're going
 18 to add a little introductory thing. We're going add
 19 some language that says we discussed this and voted to
 20 accept it. And include the vote count to send this.
 21 MS. CHEEVER: We're taking out the cc's and we
 22 are sending it to our state regulator colleagues.
 23 MR. HERMANN: What if we unanimously vote for
 24 it and just have it say "unanimously"?
 25 FACILITATOR KERN: Yes, a unanimous vote of

1 the 13 community members.
 2 Any other discussion?
 3 MR. HARRIS: If we put in the letter the vote
 4 of 13, how many RAB members are we supposed to have? 13
 5 out of 500 is not very much, but 13 out of 10 --
 6 MS. CHEEVER: Well, it's about 17 or 18, but I
 7 think there are some people on this list who may have
 8 resigned.
 9 MS. MONAGHAN: We have 17 active members, so
 10 13 out of 17.
 11 MR. SUTTER: We can say "a unanimous vote of
 12 all RAB members present."
 13 FACILITATOR KERN: Any other discussion?
 14 MR. CALLANAN: Move the question.
 15 FACILITATOR KERN: All in favor, raise your
 16 hand. Opposed. Motion carries. Julie is going to get
 17 the count.
 18 MS. CHEEVER: 13.
 19 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. Thank you very
 20 much to Craig and Brian for your answering questions and
 21 working with us on this. I think all this has been
 22 offered in the spirit of constructive optimism yet with
 23 some sense of urgency too. And we continue to put our
 24 trust in you guys.
 25 MR. HARRIS: I would like to also add that the

1 included that, but it seems like it would be a relevant
 2 part. Are there any other items or announcements?
 3 Thank you very much for your participation.
 4 Tonight's meeting is adjourned.
 5 [Meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.]
 6 ---oOo---
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 letter in no way reflects the fact that you, Brian,
 2 could not have articulated your feelings very clearly,
 3 as you said you could have done.
 4 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm very comfortable with the
 5 letter. Thank you.
 6 FACILITATOR KERN: A couple other housekeeping
 7 items just to tidy up here.
 8 I did want to -- I think it was something you said that
 9 I just want to highlight. The Trust has offered some
 10 language and then Brian O'Neill is going to respond to
 11 that, so there are some things still in the works.
 12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. It's still in the
 13 works, and I think it would be quite fair to put on the
 14 committee agenda an update of where things are and where
 15 they have been in the next two weeks.
 16 FACILITATOR KERN: All right. New business.
 17 Recently released documents. Is that self-explanatory?
 18 Review of action items. For the committee meeting I've
 19 got Landfill E Land Fill 8 and 10 and an update on this
 20 situation that we have just discussed.
 21 For the RAB meeting, I've got cleanup levels update and
 22 groundwater presentation. Any other items passed
 23 through appropriate channels?
 24 MR. ANDERSON: Was the lake [inaudible]?
 25 FACILITATOR KERN: I don't think we had

1 BOARD MEMBERS:
 2 Jerry Anderson
 3 Bob Boggs, California Department of Toxic Substances
 4 Control
 5 Edward F. Callanan, Jr.
 6 Julia Cheever
 7 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
 8 Dennis Downing
 9 Willard Harris
 10 Joel Hermann
 11 Doug Kern
 12 Jan Monaghan
 13 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
 14 Peter O'Hara
 15 Jane Packer, Presidio Trust
 16 James Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
 17 David Sutter
 18 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
 19 Tracy Wright
 20 Gloria Yarros
 21 Mark Youngkin
 22
 23 OTHERS:
 24 Dorinda Shipman, Treadwell and Rollo
 25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

APRIL 9, 2002
7:00 p.m.
---oOo---

COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Page 3

1 Committee report. Mark.
2 MR. YOUNGKINKIN: Thank you. Restoration
3 Advisory Board had its monthly Planning Committee meeting
4 on March 26th, and we went over some old business. The
5 organization chart from George Ford was the old business.
6 We had several topics of discussion. We talked about the
7 Landfill E Field Sampling Plan, the Landfill A and 10
8 Work Plan. And we had an update on the ARARs situation.
9 And I also attended a couple of other meetings in
10 the last 30 days. The Landfill E Working Group meeting
11 was held on March 29th. We had a very productive meeting
12 that day. And also the bi-monthly status meeting was on
13 April 2nd, and we basically went over everything at that
14 meeting. Our next meeting will be the fourth Tuesday of
15 this month, and I hope to see you all there. Thank you.
16 MR. KERN: Thanks, Mark. Any questions? Okay.
17 Item 5. Reports and discussions. We'll start with Craig
18 Cooper. We're already to you, Craig.
19 MR. COOPER: Okay. We have our first
20 announcement is the arrival of Kyle McLeod Nelson, Chris
21 Nelson's new son. And mother is doing great. Baby's
22 very healthy, as you can tell from the picture. So it's
23 pretty exciting.
24 MR. FORD: Chris is not here tonight because
25 he's taking three weeks off to learn how to change a

Page 2

1
2 MR. KERN: Let us begin. Welcome everyone to
3 the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, our regular
4 monthly meeting, April 2002. Tonight is the completion
5 of eight years of service for the Restoration Advisory
6 Board, beginning our ninth year tonight. That's a good
7 effort.
8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Are you saying this was the
9 first meeting, in April?
10 MR. KERN: It was April, 1994. Does everyone
11 have an agenda?
12 MR. BERMAN: I am just curious. Are you and
13 Mark the only original members here tonight?
14 MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm not original.
15 MR. KERN: I guess I'm the only original
16 member.
17 MR. BERMAN: On the RAB itself, there's you,
18 and there's Peter and Julie?
19 MR. KERN: Jan Monaghan. I think there were
20 three.
21 Welcome to the Trust and the contractors, Park
22 Service, regulators, community members and members of the
23 public who are here tonight. Thanks for coming out. Any
24 changes to the agenda tonight?
25 Seeing none, any announcements or old business?

Page 4

1 diaper. We should see him again next month.
2 MS. YAROS: Can he learn it in three weeks?
3 MR. FORD: He probably can learn it in about
4 ten minutes, but he'll need some practice to really get
5 the hang of it.
6 MR. BERMAN: Well, as a member of the cleanup
7 crew --
8 MR. KERN: Hazardous waste.
9 MR. COOPER: With respect to the Feasibility
10 Study, the first component of what I want to talk about
11 is the ARARs. That is a good-news item, finally. We are
12 happy to report that we've reached a consensus with the
13 Park Service on certain locations of specific ARARs, and
14 Brian O'Neil and Craig Middleton wrote a letter to the
15 RAB, which I've been told was sent out to everybody.
16 That's a big breakthrough because that allows us a
17 couple of things. First of all, it allows us now to move
18 forward on the Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 Remedial Action
19 Plan. And George will talk about that in more detail in
20 a minute. But also it's one of two of the kinds of
21 hitches that the Feasibility Study was facing.
22 The Feasibility Study was facing a very (INAUDIBLE)
23 ARARs and then one on cleanup levels. So that only
24 really leaves now the Cleanup Level document to be
25 finalized for -- or really for the Trust and DTSC and the

1 Regional Board to reach agreement on cleanup levels so we
2 can get those into the Feasibility Study and then get a
3 Draft Feasibility Study report out on the street which we
4 hope will happen by early- or mid-summer.

5 So regarding cleanup levels, in order to kind-of
6 expedite the communications between the Presidio Trust
7 and the Park Service and the state, we've consolidated
8 our cleanup levels all in kind of one comprehensive table
9 that's a good vehicle to communicate because we can
10 bounce it around by Email very quickly. And I've had a
11 couple meetings with Bob and Jim, and based on Bob's
12 recommendations, made some changes to the cleanup levels.
13 And I forget, maybe two weeks ago now, I sent over an
14 Email to Bob saying this is basically my final
15 recommendation regarding cleanup levels. And I'm just
16 kind-of waiting for Bob to get back to us on that.
17 That's the story on that. Maybe when Bob comes in, he
18 can speak to how his review is going with respect to the
19 Email that I sent over with the (INAUDIBLE) cleanup
20 levels.

21 Any questions on the Feasibility Study, ARARS, or
22 cleanup levels before I move on?

23 MR. BERMAN: Craig, is there a separate ARAR
24 discussion taking place on the cleanup levels?

25 MR. COOPER: A separate ARAR -- you mean,

1 the -- okay. No. No. For the Cleanup Level Document,
2 there is not ARARs specific to that document. Now for
3 the Feasibility Study and for the RAP that's written for
4 the Feasibility Study, there will be lots of ARARs for
5 all those sites.

6 MR. BERMAN: But there's no specific ARAR
7 requirement?

8 MR. COOPER: To issue a Cleanup Level Document?
9 No.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Some of the cleanup levels are
11 determined by ARARs.

12 MR. COOPER: Exactly.

13 MR. BERMAN: That's why I thought there would
14 be an ARAR discussion around it.

15 MR. COOPER: Only Remedial Action Plans. They
16 are the documents that really have ARARs associated with
17 them.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: In a classic sense, the
19 Cleanup Level Document would be part of the AFS. It
20 would all be kind of part of the package. And for the
21 project, it's just a separate document. But it's still
22 part of the package --

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: These ARARs will carry over into
24 the FS?

25 MR. COOPER: Yeah. That conceptual agreement

1 the Trust and the Park Service agreed on, not only will
2 that work for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, we made it
3 comprehensive. So now we know kind-of the road map on
4 how to apply those particular locations with specific
5 ARARs to all remediation sites throughout the Presidio,
6 Area A, Area B, and the borderline. We really tried to
7 think through all the potential scenarios so we don't
8 have to revisit this sticky situation.

9 Okay. Moving on. As Mark mentioned, on Landfill E,
10 we have -- as you know, for the last several months --
11 just to back up for a minute, DTSC has required the
12 Presidio Trust to do some characterization work on
13 Landfill E so we can have a -- better analyze the
14 alternatives in the Feasibility Studies for Landfill E.
15 So that's what kind-of kicked off this characterization
16 study, and we sat down with a pen, and we've been sitting
17 down and talking to DTSC, the Regional Board and the RAB
18 regarding how to set up this Characterization Study. And
19 we had draft DQOs, and etc. And then we came up with the
20 draft investigation strategy, and then sat down with DTSC
21 and the RAB again. We wanted to get their comments
22 basically up front on the Investigation Table. And so we
23 can get those fundamental ideas incorporated first before
24 EKI starts working on a Work Plan.

25 I really like that model better than, for example,

1 EKI working on a work plan, and it's got everyone to look
2 at it, and you have a whole bunch of comments. So the
3 idea is to get comments on the fundamental strategy
4 first. And so the Work Plan is at least going in the
5 right direction from a fundamental perspective. We know
6 that we're still going to get comments from regulators
7 and stuff like that, but hopefully, this type of initial
8 scoping and meeting with stakeholders -- incorporating
9 their good ideas and stuff will lay a good foundation for
10 the Work Plan.

11 The ideas and comments that we got from the RAB and
12 DTSC, I've agreed with them. The incremental amounts --
13 not only were they good ideas, the incremental amount of
14 costs associated with them were not very much at all.
15 Now it's just a matter of -- I do need to talk those
16 changes over with Tom Kingston, my supervisor, and then
17 once I get his okay, then EKI will start working on the
18 Work Plan.

19 If any other RAB members want to know what the
20 comments are that we got from DTSC and the RAB about how
21 to improve the Landfill E Investigation Work Plan, I can
22 go over that, or -- the draft will be issued in about a
23 month or so. Okay?

24 MR. BERMAN: There was one interesting
25 technical point that come up in the committee meeting,

1 and it had to do with whether you could get actually
2 below the fill in the central regions and get down in and
3 to actually see what's down below because a backhoe would
4 not go deep enough to measure that. I was wondering was
5 that resolved?

6 MR. COOPER: Right. We are doing borings at
7 three different locations.

8 MR. BERMAN: But no trenching.

9 MR. COOPER: Right. Trenching can't get down
10 that deep. Trenching goes 15 feet, plus or minus. So
11 we're going to use -- in other words, to characterize the
12 waste in the lower, you know, below 15 feet of the
13 landfill, we have to use borings.

14 MR. BERMAN: There was no change in that. That
15 was the original idea.

16 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

17 MR. BERMAN: And that's kind of a hit and miss
18 right? Because unless you do a huge number of borings,
19 you get whatever you get. Presumably, the borings are --
20 the bores are 6 inches in diameter?

21 MR. COOPER: The drilling technique, the
22 outside diameter of a boring -- eight?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Borings would be (INAUDIBLE).

24 MR. BERMAN: So probably 4 inches then.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: Eight inches.

1 MR. FORD: It's an eight-inch hole. The
2 sampling recovers about three and a quarter or something
3 like that.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the tools to
5 investigate that would be a video camera down the hole.
6 So you can get a little bit more information than just
7 the cuttings.

8 MR. COOPER: Right. So we'll look at cuttings
9 as it comes up. And the video camera -- it's not as good
10 as being able to look right at a trench, you know, down
11 to 15 feet, but it's the acceptable technology to look
12 deeper into landfills.

13 MR. PONTON: How many wells?

14 MR. COOPER: Because we've agreed to -- three
15 wells and two wells and two pedometers.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: The target is that most of the
17 borings and wells are going to the interface layer which
18 might be the first (INAUDIBLE) waste in the native soil.
19 Some are going to the water table. So there's two wells
20 that go down (INAUDIBLE) deep, presume deeper water table
21 (INAUDIBLE).

22 MR. PONTON: Right now there is two wells in
23 the shallow?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right now there's five. In
25 the landfill there are no wells in the waste itself.

1 There are two (INAUDIBLE) and a total of six wells
2 outside.

3 MR. COOPER: So with the additional three more
4 wells and two more pedometers, that should give us
5 (INAUDIBLE) characterize the hydraulics of the site, and
6 try to get a better idea of the -- there was one question
7 was does the groundwater rise up and interact with the
8 bottom of the waste? Hopefully that will be found out.
9 We decided to agree with the DTSC's and RAB's suggestion.
10 We decided two of the borings -- we were just going to
11 leave those two borings in the (INAUDIBLE) and we decided
12 to (INAUDIBLE) those pedometers and give us more
13 information regarding (INAUDIBLE) map, seasonal
14 fluctuation of the water table.

15 So that is the Landfill E investigation strategy.
16 So as soon as I get the okay from my management on that,
17 which shouldn't be a problem, EKI will start working on a
18 Work Plan because our goal still is to implement the Work
19 Plan before the rains start this year. That will be our
20 goal. Stay tuned on that. Any other questions on
21 Landfill E?

22 MR. PONTON: I asked Jennifer to do their
23 Sampling Plan for the (INAUDIBLE). Is that going to be a
24 part of this big plan (INAUDIBLE) are they integrated
25 somehow or are they separate?

1 MS. COATS: I haven't worked on the Plan. I
2 don't know. We already have that commitment in place. I
3 think that still stands as far as the Groundwater
4 Monitoring Program.

5 MR. FORD: When they flow, we're going to
6 sample them.

7 MR. COOPER: Yeah. We put that in a letter
8 already?

9 MR. FORD: Yeah.

10 MR. COOPER: Okay. Well, on the Public Service
11 Hospital, nothing new, I guess, since the last committee
12 report with DTSC is undergoing review. Brian and I are
13 working the document through our internal NEPA people,
14 both -- since it's on the borderline between Area A and
15 Area B, we have to meet with both the Trust and the Park
16 Service NEPA review boards.

17 So the last thing I'm going to talk about is the
18 Contingency Plan which I think George has mentioned
19 before that that's a really important project for the
20 Trust to get through the regulatory process and to get a
21 decision document out on because a) the purpose of that
22 plan is to allow us to, when we hit unenumerated
23 contamination that we have now a CERCLA document that
24 sets up the rules on how to address and clean up that
25 contamination; and secondly, our project on the Letterman

Page 13

1 Project is contingent on that, closing out the
2 Letterman/LAIR clean up. We need the Contingency Plan
3 Document approved by DTSC. So stay tuned for a draft
4 document being released to the regulators very soon on
5 that. We'll use the typical notification process to the
6 RAB on that. And that's all I have to say. George will
7 take it from here.

8 MR. BERMAN: Does Zurich have any input into
9 the Contingency Plan at all?

10 MR. COOPER: Zurich doesn't review
11 deliverables.

12 MR. BERMAN: Right. But in a sense -- maybe I
13 misunderstood something here -- if there is some
14 undiscovered toxicity that was not in the Regional
15 Transfer Agreement between the Trust and the Army and the
16 Trust, then doesn't the Contingency Document deal with
17 that also?

18 MR. COOPER: Right. That's the goal of it.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Sam, one thing is that it's
20 not exactly parallel with the definitions. It's separate
21 from the definitions of the (INAUDIBLE) Army. So the
22 Contingency Plan will also address unexpected
23 contamination finds that are identified in the Army
24 document. That's a very -- made that definition very
25 broad. And so there would be times when you encounter

Page 14

1 contamination as a surprise, but under the definition in
2 the agreement of the Army, it is a known contaminant.
3 The definitions don't track lay terminology.

4 MR. BERMAN: Okay. In other words, the
5 Contingency Plan, let's say that we look at the so-called
6 known contaminants in the Transfer Agreement. We look
7 through those. Let's say that something is discovered
8 which is not one of those known contaminants. Zirconium
9 (INAUDIBLE).

10 MR. COOPER: Okay.

11 MR. BERMAN: Does the Contingency Plan deal
12 with that?

13 MR. COOPER: Yes.

14 MR. BERMAN: In a sense, that would be
15 something that the insurance policy would also look at?

16 MR. COOPER: Right.

17 MR. FORD: It's a separate process. We would
18 deal with it as a contingency action, and then when we
19 had all the bills and figured out how much it all cost,
20 or while we were paying the bills, the Trust would sit
21 down and go through both our insurance policy and our
22 agreement with the Army. And we would determine --
23 because there's a lot of different nuances. And you
24 could have sites that we would be submitting a claim
25 against the Army.

Page 15

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Army is first in line.

2 MR. FORD: Yeah. If it's unknown, we go back
3 to the Army first.

4 MR. BERMAN: So the Contingency Plan then
5 specifies the program for doing all this.

6 MR. COOPER: Exactly. Even if the Army ends up
7 doing it or paying for it, we have a Contingency Plan.
8 We have a CERCLA Decision Document that lays out the
9 parameters on whoever does or pays for it, what the rules
10 are, so --

11 MR. BERMAN: Even though it might end up for
12 some unknown reason that Zurich was going to pay for it,
13 they still have no input into the development of this
14 Contingency Plan.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that's true.

16 MR. BERMAN: It's just usually when there's
17 somebody there that's going to pay, in case, it's these
18 contingencies, right where (INAUDIBLE) something that the
19 insurances might have to deal with. But the payer in
20 this case has nothing to say about the Contingency Plan.

21 MR. FORD: But with Zurich, in some cases they
22 may be the payer, but there are a lot of cases where they
23 may not be.

24 MR. BERMAN: Right. No, I'm just considering
25 that possibility because when you're laying out a plan

Page 16

1 here, and then presumably, let's say that under the odd
2 circumstance that you do find one of these contaminants
3 which are unspecified --

4 MR. COOPER: The unknown condition.

5 MR. BERMAN: -- in the MOA, yeah.

6 MR. COOPER: Right. We'll file a claim to
7 Zurich in accordance with that particular insurance
8 policy, and then Zurich will make a decision as to
9 whether it's a reasonable cost or not for the unknown
10 condition.

11 MR. BERMAN: This is just a program to do that.
12 So that's why you really don't have to involve them.

13 MR. COOPER: Right. It's two different things.

14 MR. BERMAN: I just need an explanation.

15 MR. COOPER: Claims under an insurance policy
16 will be different than a regulatory process.

17 MR. NELSON: So you're just spelling out the
18 procedures.

19 MR. COOPER: Right.

20 MR. FORD: Zurich does retain the right to
21 review ultimately. They get to review everything in the
22 end when we send them the bill. And then they say, "Yes,
23 we pay." "No, we're not going to pay." Effectively,
24 what they do is they say that the expense can be charged
25 against our deductible or not. When they say it's not

Page 17

1 deductible, then it's effectively a disallowing expense.
2 So if they do have -- I mean, the way the whole operation
3 is set up, their review comes at the end.

4 MR. BERMAN: So then there is an input to this
5 thing from Zurich. At the end, somehow, they look at
6 this document when it's all done.

7 MR. FORD: Well, they won't look at the
8 document so much as they will be seeing the results of
9 the work done under the document. And so all have a
10 responsibility at some level to keep that in mind. We
11 want to make sure that the Contingency Plan is a
12 reasonable and sensible and logical document simply
13 because if it's goofy, and then we generate costs under a
14 plan that's grossly ineffective in some way, we are
15 increasing the odds that Zurich will review these costs
16 and say, "We disallow these because they are
17 extraordinary or unusual." So we are trying to keep it
18 as logical and focused as we can.

19 MR. BERMAN: My question really had to do with
20 the procedure. What you're saying is that if a claim was
21 made, than Zurich would review -- how do you call these
22 things -- I was trying to say, would it be simpler at an
23 early stage to have Zurich's input to the Contingency
24 Plan? That's a procedure which they more or less agree
25 with.

Page 18

1 MR. FORD: No. I think we've got enough
2 players right now already.

3 MR. COOPER: No. I'd rather run the gamble. I
4 mean, if they come back and say, "Why did you follow
5 those procedures?" I'm going to say, "We were following
6 the regulator's preapproved plan to do that.

7 MR. FORD: I can tell you, Sam, having looked
8 at the Plan, it's pretty plain meat and potatoes.
9 There's really nothing exotic or wild in there. It's
10 sort of a normal Contingency Plan where you treat a site,
11 a newly-discovered site in a way that they've always been
12 treated, both here and in other places. I'd be really
13 surprised if there is anything in that plan that would be
14 viewed by Zurich or anybody else as extraordinary and out
15 of line. I mean time will tell, but I'd be very
16 surprised if any part of the plan is seen to be unusual.

17 MR. COOPER: Take it away, George.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: One question. The insurance
19 policy itself. Is that a public document? Would that be
20 in the library?

21 MR. COOPER: It's a redacted version of the
22 insurance policy. It is public and can be made public.
23 Is it in the library right now? Yes.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. FORD: Okay. Next slide. Landfill 4/Fill

Page 19

1 Site 5. We have traction again on this project now that
2 the ARARs are taken care of. We're incorporating the
3 ARARs, the final agreed-upon ARARs into the RAP, and
4 we're making final revisions to that in the Work Plan.
5 We're trying to put together a whole package that has the
6 RAP, the Work Plan, the Proposed Plan, and a package of
7 CEQA documents that we can then send out for review.
8 We're hoping to get that out as soon as we can. I can't
9 project a date right now, but it should be within roughly
10 the next month or so that it will come out to see the
11 light of day.

12 One of the thoughts that has come up is that because
13 we think the Cleanup Level Document is far enough along
14 that if it goes final before we do the actual remedial
15 work at Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, we might as well just
16 make it a final RAP. I mean, if we use approved cleanup
17 levels, there's really no reason to keep the document as
18 an Interim RAP. And so we're going to be watching that
19 closely, and if the Cleanup Level Document can be
20 finalized fairly soon, we will request or recommend that
21 we change the interim RAP to a final RAP. If we're able
22 to do that, then once we dig it and do everything in the
23 RAP and start the monitoring, we should be done with that
24 site, other than the monitoring, forever.

25 We're also working on a bid package. We're actually

Page 20

1 putting together a bid package for both Landfill 4 and
2 Fill Site 5. The original thinking that the Trust would
3 do Landfill 4 in-house, the Trust is not thinking that
4 way anymore. Because of the way the Zurich policy is set
5 up, we have an incentive to contract out this kind of
6 work rather than do it in-house. And besides that, with
7 the current situation in the Trust, the Trust is
8 interested in reducing staff salary costs rather than
9 raising it. In all likelihood -- in fact, it's more than
10 in all likelihood -- we will be bidding out 4 and 5
11 together, separately, to get bids from outside
12 contractors. I'm working on that right now. And right
13 now the schedule shows the start of digging around
14 October 1st.

15 We're looking at the schedule and see if we can cut
16 some time out of that and start it sooner. It may be
17 possible to advance it some weeks, but we still have a
18 number of administrative steps to go through, so probably
19 a safe date to point at would be about October 1st.

20 MR. PONTON: How long a job is it if you
21 started on the first?

22 MR. FORD: They're both about six weeks. We
23 may very well do them concurrently. They're right next
24 to each other. We think it makes a lot of sense to
25 really just sort of turn the two parcels over to the

1 contractor and say, "You do it in order." They'll have
2 to tell us how they want to do it, but we would give them
3 the freedom to use one as a staging area for the other or
4 however they wanted to do it. So my guess is that the
5 whole thing, the main portion of the field work would be
6 done in about six weeks, probably by the end of
7 (INAUDIBLE).

8 MS. YAROS: (INAUDIBLE) economics or to get
9 more going?

10 MR. FORD: The history of this project -- when
11 we started looking at it a little over a year ago, the
12 Trust at the time was thinking that we were going to do a
13 lot of these smaller landfills in-house; you know, that
14 we'd hire half a dozen operators and rent or buy
15 bulldozers and everything else, and we would do these
16 kinds of jobs in-house.

17 That thinking has changed over the last year for a
18 couple of different reasons. One is that our insurance
19 policy really provides an incentive for us to contract
20 this work out because work that is contracted out is
21 clearly chargeable against our insurance deductible,
22 whereas money spent on salaries for Trust workers is not,
23 under normal circumstances, chargeable against the
24 deductible. So that kind of gives us an incentive to
25 contract it out.

1 both. And I would think that if there is going to be
2 any type of volume discount or savings on a mo and de-mo,
3 that's the only way we're going to get it, is if one
4 company's doing the whole ball of wax. And from our
5 perspective, that's also better in that all the
6 contractors can come to work here, we have to teach them
7 kind-of the "Presidio way," which is a little quieter and
8 tidier and more careful than they might work in other
9 areas. It's easier for us to do that if we only have one
10 contractor that we have to train rather than two. I
11 think we will bid them out as a bid package and require
12 people to bid both of them together.

13 MS. YAROS: I'm sorry, George. Then I really
14 don't know what you meant when you said you bid it
15 separately. Did I misunderstand?

16 MR. FORD: I may have misspoken. The plan
17 is -- a year ago we were thinking of splitting them up,
18 but now we're get keeping them together, and we'll have
19 one bid package that will cover both sides. And we'll
20 get bids from contractors to do both sides together. And
21 whoever bids low and meets the other requirements, we'll
22 give them the work. The Trust is not going to be doing
23 Landfill 4 with our own forces.

24 MR. COOPER: Can I ask a procedural question
25 about when the Draft RAP goes public, and we have this

1 MR. COOPER: Another big incentive is
2 insurance. The liability insurance for -- if we were to
3 do it ourselves, hire our own people, rent our own
4 dumptrucks and take it to a landfill, then there's -- if
5 the truck gets into an accident, if it dumps over, there
6 is all kind of incredible liability insurance that we
7 would have to buy. We're not an the environmental
8 remediation company. That's what we'd almost have to
9 form, a little -- we just thought about it some more, and
10 there is just some incredible complexities that we didn't
11 want to get into. It sounded like a simple idea on the
12 surface. But once we start digging into it some more,
13 it's not so simple.

14 MR. PONTON: You wouldn't give people the
15 option to bid on both to save costs?

16 MR. FORD: No, actually we wouldn't. We would
17 probably package them both and say, "You can bid on -- "

18 MR. PONTON: One? Either one or both?

19 MR. FORD: I have to think about that. I think
20 we would probably want them to bid on both.

21 MR. PONTON: If you have different companies
22 working on different sites to coordinate them together so
23 they work (INAUDIBLE).

24 MR. FORD: I wouldn't want to do that. I would
25 much rather have one contractor who's going to do them

1 public comment period, you know, we have to have a public
2 meeting. And we were thinking of having the public
3 meeting on a second Tuesday of the month if it works out
4 right. It depends on how our public comment period is.
5 If it starts the day before the second Tuesday of the
6 month, then that doesn't make sense. We couldn't do it
7 that way. But if the second Tuesday of the month is kind
8 of at the second or third week of our public comment
9 period, would it be all right with you guys to have our
10 public meeting the same day as the RAB meeting, or do you
11 want to stay away from the second Tuesday of the month?

12 MR. BERMAN: What hour of the day would you
13 have the meeting?

14 MR. COOPER: We could start it as early as 6:00
15 and maybe finish, and then you could have your regular
16 RAB meeting. We could go from 6:00 to 8:00 for the
17 official public meeting for the Landfill 4/Fill Site 5
18 and we could close that down, so that's to receive
19 official public comment from RAB and from the public in
20 general. And then we could advertise that to go from
21 6:00 to 8:00. And then if you wanted to, then we'd be
22 willing to stay, and we could have a little mini-RAB
23 meeting from 8:00 to 9:00 or whatever to --

24 MS. YAROS: Just logistics.

25 MS. RYAN: Hi. I'm sorry I came in late. My

1 name is Pat Ryan, and I work for DTSC in Public
 2 Participation, for those of you who don't know me. This
 3 is right exactly up my alley. A lot of the facilities I
 4 work with do -- recently we had a RAB at Mare Island, and
 5 we did that. We had the public meeting the first hour of
 6 the scheduled RAB meeting, and it worked out very well.
 7 In fact, we did it twice, two RAB meetings in a row. So
 8 it is very efficient because generally people are
 9 accustomed to coming that night. We public-notice it
 10 ahead of time, which is legally required, and we send out
 11 a fact sheet which we generate in time for people to get
 12 it in advance and also have it available. But it is a
 13 really very efficient way to do it meeting-wise. It's so
 14 difficult to schedule all these meetings. So we do
 15 support that.

16 MR. COOPER: And that way you guys wouldn't
 17 have to come to two meetings in a month.

18 MR. FORD: I should also throw in here, we're
 19 most likely looking at either June or July as being the
 20 public comment period that will occur somewhere in there.

21 MR. KERN: We have done this previously, so I
 22 think it works out.

23 MR. COOPER: It's okay.

24 MR. KERN: I don't know if you would
 25 necessarily need a full two-hour public meeting.

1 MS. RYAN: Well, at Mare Island, we had early
 2 transfers, which was controversial, and we managed to do
 3 it within an hour. So that was the whole thing, the
 4 presentation and the questions and the formal comments.
 5 I would work with Jane, and we would have it organized to
 6 where an hour would probably be more than sufficient.

7 MR. COOPER: All right. Okay. Excellent.

8 MR. FORD: Next slide. LAIR. The buildings
 9 are both gone. The contractor is still grinding up the
 10 concrete and making those mountains of drum concrete
 11 taller. All of the sewers have been removed, and we have
 12 taken all of the sewer trench samples. We have results
 13 back for, I believe, the first two taken. The rest of
 14 them are in the pipeline. The first couple show no
 15 biological or chemical agents or really anything else of
 16 concern. I can tell you, I looked at most of the length
 17 of the main trunk sewers as they were being removed. It
 18 was 12-inch clay pipe with green plastic gaskets, and it
 19 was in perfect condition. It looked like it had been
 20 installed yesterday. It had been down there 30-something
 21 years, but it was in great condition. The interior of
 22 the pipe was generally absolutely clean. There was no
 23 sediment or anything else in there. Fortunately that was
 24 uneventful. And we're sort of expecting that -- we'll
 25 see the results when we get them, but we're expecting the

1 rest of the analytical results of the trench samples to
 2 be uneventful.

3 We did get some pesticide hits. We took some
 4 samples beneath the floor slab of LAIR. And it appears
 5 that the Army applied pesticides to the site before they
 6 laid down their drain rock and poured the foundation or
 7 the basement floor slabs. So we had one hit of Chlordane
 8 that exceeded the -- I guess it exceeded the proposed
 9 residential cleanup level. It was also slightly above
 10 the institutional cleanup level, that was kind-of smack
 11 dab in the middle of the LAIR footprint, and we had been
 12 working with DTSC to do some additional digging there to
 13 try to get that stuff out of there and do follow-up
 14 sampling to document that what is left there is below the
 15 cleanup levels.

16 We're shooting for the residential cleanup levels
 17 for a couple of reasonings. I guess PTIP is going to
 18 show the Letterman site as a possible residential use,
 19 and I think maybe the GNPA shows that also. And also our
 20 contract with Lucas Film requires us to achieve
 21 residential cleanup levels if at all possible for the
 22 site before we turn it over. So we're working on that.
 23 I don't really expect that to be very eventful either.
 24 It's just a matter of doing a little bit of additional
 25 digging in the area where this Chlordane hit was. So I

1 hope next month I can report that that's taken care of.

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: Will Lucas spray the bottom of
 3 that floor with pesticides?

4 MR. FORD: I hope not, and we'll encourage them
 5 not to do that. I gather that this is common in -- or at
 6 least for a while -- was common in federal construction,
 7 because we know Bruce Anderson used to build prisons, and
 8 he told us that there was a standard thing in their specs
 9 that they always applied -- they sprayed a pesticide
 10 before they poured anything. But I haven't heard of
 11 other commercial contractors. I've watched a lot of
 12 basement floor slabs being poured, and I've never seen a
 13 commercial contractor do that. We will encourage them
 14 not to apply any additional pesticides to the site.

15 MR. BERMAN: Because commercial contractors are
 16 less concerned about gophers.

17 MR. FORD: Where this occurred, this is
 18 something like 16 feet below the original ground surface.
 19 So I don't know what the pocket gophers' range is, but
 20 this area has been down deep in the dark for 30 years. I
 21 don't think this was the area that gophers would be
 22 messing around.

23 MR. PONTON: Would you reach groundwater?

24 MR. FORD: No. It's probably about 10 feet
 25 above groundwater, something like that.

Page 29

1 MR. PONTON: Now with the rain (INAUDIBLE)
2 infiltrating the groundwater?

3 MR. FORD: Well, I hope we're not doing that.
4 That's one of the reasons we want to dig it out. So I
5 don't know. That's something we'll have to consider.

6 MR. BERMAN: George, the gopher comment was
7 meant metaphorically.

8 MR. FORD: I tell you, LAIR has been a site
9 that's had me pulling my hair out for quite a while. I
10 had about a month's worth of relaxation, but then when
11 this pesticide came up, I started yanking on my hair
12 again.

13 MR. BERMAN: What's going to happen with the
14 mounds of ground concrete?

15 MR. FORD: My understanding is that roughly
16 40 percent of it is going to be taken away for people to
17 use as road base or concrete aggregate elsewhere, and 60
18 percent of it will stay there and will be used as road
19 base and concrete aggregate for the new project.

20 MR. BERMAN: So it's actually going to go back
21 into the ground in some way.

22 MR. FORD: Yes. It's going to go back into the
23 building. That's the plan.

24 MR. PONTON: How big an area is it?

25 MR. FORD: The footprint of LAIR?

Page 31

1 degrade very easily. But I don't think it's
2 exceptionally toxic to humans. I know until a few years
3 ago, you could buy it in a power form to be used around
4 planting beds around your house. I don't know if you can
5 still get it. But it is banned.

6 The concentration we're talking about is just over
7 one part per million. The cleanup level is about 4
8 tenths of a part per million, and the hit that we had was
9 1.4. So the concentrations are pretty low. But our
10 cleanup levels are lower still.

11 Okay. Next slide. Tanks and Minicaps. Brian
12 Seelbach is pushing these along. We are looking to
13 remove 13 tanks from the coastal batteries in May and
14 June. He is putting a project through our NEPA, NHPA and
15 the Park Services, NEPA and the NHPA review process. We
16 hope to do those removals in May and June.

17 We currently have 33 No-Further-Action requests
18 pending with the City of San Francisco. We think we'll
19 probably send a posse down there to go sit in their
20 office and wait until they send us a letter that actually
21 says we don't have to do anything else for 33 of these
22 sites.

23 We are also looking ahead to try to serve up
24 basically a new batch of tanks and Minicap sites every
25 quarter so that we can work through these things and get

Page 30

1 MR. PONTON: The contamination.

2 MR. FORD: We're sort of sampling our way out
3 of it, so I don't know. We just had it in one spot. I
4 don't know what the footprint of the building is. I'll
5 have to get a map and scale it. It's a 100 by --

6 MR. PONTON: It's not covered though, is it?

7 MR. FORD: No. It's open. I'll find out what
8 the footprint area is. We can show you the pattern of
9 the sample. We get the samples done on 48-hour
10 turnaround, so we hope to have an answer to this question
11 fairly soon.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: This would answer kind-of the
13 mysterious pesticide hits we kind-of run across every now
14 and then. Maybe the Army sprayed a lot of the buildings
15 here that went in; all these little low-level
16 miscellaneous hits now and then?

17 MR. FORD: Well, it might. And I think
18 virtually every landfill we have on the property has some
19 level of pesticide. So I think we have evidence that the
20 Army was pretty free in their use of pesticides.

21 MS. YAROS: Is this particularly toxic,
22 Chlordane?

23 MR. FORD: Chlordane -- I'm not an expert on
24 pesticides. I believe that it's long-life. You put it
25 down and it stays where you put it, and it doesn't

Page 32

1 them all done within the next 18 to 24 months.

2 MR. BERMAN: George, back on the LAIR. When is
3 the date for the deconstruction demolition to be actually
4 finished?

5 MR. FORD: The demolition contractor should be
6 off of the site by May 12th. The Trust has a few other
7 little odds and ends that we'll be doing there. We're
8 also shooting for -- to close the deal and actually
9 transfer the site to -- essentially turn over the keys to
10 Lucas around the first of September.

11 MR. BERMAN: So from the first of May to the
12 first of September there is some planned activities by
13 the Trust?

14 MR. FORD: There are a few, and I have to
15 confess I don't know precisely what they are. But I
16 think it's sort of a low-level, putting up signs, moving
17 around fences, that sort of thing.

18 MR. BERMAN: By May 1st, the 40 percent of the
19 ground concrete is going to be gone, and just the
20 60 percent is going to be left there?

21 MR. FORD: I believe so, yeah.

22 MR. BERMAN: So there will just be a pile of
23 pillars. Ground concrete pyramids will be sitting there
24 from the first of May until the first of September?

25 MR. FORD: I think so. I'll have to check, but

1 I believe that the plan is to store them there on site.
2 I'll find out for sure and send you an Email.

3 MR. BERMAN: It's not really important. I was
4 wondering, that's sort of a four-month period of doing
5 nothing there. It was just puzzling when you stated why
6 you wanted to do that, unless there was some real
7 significant work that had to be done.

8 MR. FORD: Yeah. I have to admit the details
9 of that project I'm a little fuzzy on. So what I need to
10 do is check with the project manager, a guy named John
11 Fong, and find out what the details are, and then I can
12 get the answer to you.

13 Any questions about tanks and Minicaps? Next slide,
14 please.

15 For our bigger petroleum sites, we've got three of
16 these cooking in one form or another right now. The
17 Building 1065 Investigation Plan we sent out some time
18 ago, and we have Jim's comments. I think Bob will be
19 commenting on it shortly, and we have both of their
20 comments. We'll incorporate them, revise the plan and
21 then try to get out there in the field as quickly as we
22 can to fill the data gaps.

23 Last week we sent out a similar investigation plan.
24 It's considerably more extensive for the Commissary and
25 PX site. It's more expensive because it's a bigger site.

1 So that went out last week. Please check your mail
2 boxes. It's about four inches thick. After we've gotten
3 people's comments on that, we'll revise it and try to get
4 out and do the site investigation at the Commissary and
5 PX as soon as we can.

6 The Trust and the Park Service also did -- we got a
7 preliminary draft of the investigation plan for the
8 Building 1349 Cap Site. That's the site that's right
9 across the street from Fill Site 5 up on Rob Hill. We've
10 provided comments to Treadwell, and they are now in the
11 process of incorporating our comments. In a little while
12 when that comes back from (INAUDIBLE) we should be able
13 to send it out, and let it (INAUDIBLE) so everyone with
14 review it.

15 MR. PONTON: 1349 was the (INAUDIBLE)
16 Distribution?

17 MR. FORD: Yeah. It was the big change up on
18 top of the hill. The Army did a partial cleanup there,
19 but they didn't dot all the I's and cross all the T's.

20 Next slide. Mountain Lake. We have a meeting of
21 the PRPs. I've never been a PRP before. I'm not sure I
22 like it. We'll be meeting April 17th at DTSC's office.
23 We expect the attendees to be the Army, CalTrans, the
24 Trust, and the Park Service. So we will have a report on
25 that, I guess, next time. We will be able to tell you

1 how it went, and what the next step is.

2 MR. BERMAN: Who's preparing the agenda?

3 MR. COOPER: DTSC is.

4 MR. KERN: Do you know what the agenda is?

5 MR. FORD: I know what my agenda is. I think
6 we -- Craig sent out a draft agenda, but it was kind of
7 like our suggestion for an agenda. I don't know if Bob
8 has taken it to heart or not. He will be setting the
9 agenda.

10 I would imagine that the discussion will go around,
11 you know, just the technical history of the project; why
12 we think there is a problem out there. And we'll
13 probably discuss everybody's theories about why the other
14 guy is responsible.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Did you say the Army would be
16 there?

17 MR. FORD: Yes. Well, The Army Corp as the
18 Army's representative.

19 MR. BERMAN: Is this a short meeting or a long
20 meeting?

21 MR. FORD: It's scheduled to start at
22 10:00 o'clock. I hope it will be done by 12:30 or 1:00
23 so we can have lunch. My guess is that it will be a
24 couple of hours. I don't expect anything to be settled.
25 This is really the first meeting of all the parties. I

1 think it's going to be like a bunch of porcupines
2 wrestling. Everybody's going to be trying to figure out
3 who's on their side or who is most dangerous to their
4 interests. And if we can come out of the meeting with
5 some kind of a task list where everybody agrees that some
6 additional things are going to be done to advance the
7 issue along and advance the discussion, I think it will
8 be a success. We're certainly not going to walk out of
9 it with a three-way split agreement to allocate financial
10 responsibilities.

11 MR. BERMAN: Wouldn't it be a good idea to come
12 prepared to that meeting with a few of these action items
13 already in your hip pocket, so to speak -- not worked
14 out, but action items of things that you want done so
15 that -- this seems to be a pretty -- there's heavy bodies
16 at this meeting. The more you get out of a meeting like
17 this, the better it is. Usually, frailties of human
18 beings dominate and whoever's got the most prepared stuff
19 often walks away with the -- you don't have to use it all
20 -- but if you come unprepared and somebody's got a lot of
21 stuff prepared, you're sort of standing with your
22 trousers about to come off.

23 MR. FORD: Actually, we're doing quite a bit of
24 work to try to get ready for this. We're having
25 preparatory meetings with the Park Service to make sure

1 that we're on the same page with them and that we don't
2 undermine each other. We're also going to meet with the
3 Army so we understand where they are before we go to the
4 meeting. Memos are being drafted and research is being
5 done. So we are going to try very hard to give a good
6 showing and demonstrate that our way of viewing this
7 problem is the correct one.

8 MR. BERMAN: I see that you already realize
9 that you have to do a bit of homework before this meeting
10 and preparation, and you're doing it. And that's very
11 encouraging.

12 Have you looked at all at the history of CalTrans
13 dealing with their own possible pollutions? Is there any
14 record of anything that they've ever done? Do you have
15 any feeling for their past?

16 MR. COOPER: You mean CalTrans cleaning up a
17 site that was contaminated by car pollution basically?

18 MR. BERMAN: Runoff from a (INAUDIBLE) or
19 anything. It could be a bridge. There's runoff from a
20 bridge. That's the first kind of example I would think
21 of, but you can have serious runoff because of drainage
22 from a bridge, and then you've got embankments that are
23 contaminated.

24 MR. COOPER: Right. Where the original source
25 of the pollution is a car?

1 MR. BERMAN: Or traffic.

2 MR. COOPER: We should have our attorneys -- we
3 haven't researched that point. That would be an attorney
4 booking and doing case law, looking for case law.

5 MR. BERMAN: I don't know if it's a legal
6 question as much as just historical. Maybe it is. I
7 don't know.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: There is some (INAUDIBLE) from
9 the Presidio, but not necessarily from cars. The State
10 of California has a volunteer cleanup agreement with
11 CalTrans for lead runoff that was lead from sandblast
12 waste, but it was attributable to CalTrans work. And
13 there are other dealings that the Park Service has had
14 with CalTrans or the Department of Interior's had with
15 CalTrans. That's one of the things we'll be talking to
16 the Trust about, what we know collectively about
17 CALTRANS' operations.

18 MR. BERMAN: Fine. Because it would be good to
19 have some of that information there at the meeting.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: Certainly if we could find out
21 if they do this all the time, we need to know that. I
22 don't think they do.

23 MS. YAROS: There was an article in the paper
24 CalTrans was paying for something. It was in the East
25 Bay, and it was on one of the bases. I was wondering if

1 --

2 MS. RYAN: Oakland?

3 MS. YAROS: Yeah, Oakland.

4 MS. RYAN: Yeah. I think there is some
5 discussion, but I'm not a technical representative, so I
6 can't really comment on it. But I know that that is an
7 issue at Oakland, the lead contamination relative to
8 highways. I don't know what determination has been made,
9 but it is quite precedent-setting, so --

10 MR. PONTON: I think the Water Board is working
11 with CalTrans on the new Bay Bridge to deal with runoff
12 from that structure, how that will be managed or treated.
13 And that was, as I understand it, it was something that
14 was kind-of overlooked, sort of last minute, and I know
15 that we're working with them on the new bridge
16 replacement span.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: And there's a number of
18 instances where the Department of Toxic Substances worked
19 with them to deal with lead along waterways, and how that
20 needs to be managed during freeway construction, widening
21 lanes, things like that.

22 MS. YAROS: I think they were actually ending
23 up paying. The Oakland site was in fact going to pay.

24 MR. COOPER: Gloria, You don't remember the
25 exact location in Oakland, 580 or the 880?

1 MS. YAROS: No, I don't.

2 MR. COOPER: Okay. Certainly we'll look into
3 it.

4 MS. YAROS: It was not too long ago.

5 MR. BERMAN: The more precedent you have for
6 CalTrans contributing to the cleanup process, and the
7 more you can bring that up in the meeting, the more
8 CalTrans has to think about what they're going to do in
9 this case here.

10 MR. COOPER: Right.

11 MS. YAROS: I think it was a military site.
12 Maybe it was the Oakland Army base.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's easy enough to look into.

14 MR. COOPER: Yeah. I think you can do searches
15 through the Chronicle, right, through the types of
16 articles? Yeah. Okay.

17 MR. FORD: Okay. Next slide, please. Skeet
18 Range Cleanup. We're getting ever closer on this thing
19 after a year and a half of wresting with the paperwork.
20 We have a bid in. The apparent low bid is the same
21 contractor that did the interim cleanup at the
22 Commissary. It's Performance Excavators from San Rafael.
23 Their bid is about \$110,000 which is pretty close to what
24 our engineer's estimate is for the job. The most
25 important thing about this is we thought we'd have to do

1 the hauling on the Promenade, which slowed down the job
2 and complicated it because the Promenade is not really
3 designed for heavy hauling.

4 This contractor has a proposal to use off-road dump
5 trucks and haul the sand that will be excavated down the
6 beach and out the Coast Guard station's driveway which is
7 really a pretty clever idea. We're glad they came up
8 with it. So we're planning to do the work that way.
9 It's scheduled to begin, the field work, on or about
10 May 28, and it will take roughly two weeks to do the work
11 and cleanup. So we're trying to get our various permits.

12 We had all of our permits in place about a year ago,
13 and most of them lasted exactly one year. We're having
14 to extend them and adjust them. We're going through the
15 process to try to get all of our permits lined up right
16 now and to sign a contract with the low bidder. So next
17 month's meeting we should have -- I'll have some more
18 details about the actual date that's going to start and
19 probably a few more details.

20 The other issue down at Crissy Field is that DTSC
21 has considered some additional information about the
22 purpose of our net monitors wells in the Building 937
23 area. We sent them a letter a couple of days ago sort of
24 stating our case and making our point that we think that
25 the monitoring that we proposed is adequate. DTSC will

1 be reviewing that proposal, and they'll get back to us.
2 And after that happens, we hope to do the final soil
3 sampling and water sampling down there, and then we can
4 move to deal with writing a Crissy Field Closure report
5 which is one of our tasks for late in summer and early
6 fall.

7 MR. BERMAN: Do you expect to find anything
8 unusual in that skeet range at all? Is there anything
9 there other than the skeet itself?

10 MR. FORD: Well, we've already found oil out
11 there. When we were doing the sampling, we found that in
12 the area by the riprap, close to the riprap, there is
13 oily soil and oily sand that we hadn't expected. So
14 we're taking that out as part of the cleanup. That's
15 been incorporated into the skeet cleanup. Beyond that, I
16 guess all I can say is I hope we don't have more
17 surprises simply because working down there on the beach,
18 that's a bad place for surprises. Work has to be
19 coordinated with the tide fluctuation. So it's a tricky
20 spot to work. But you know it's like any other thing
21 that we dig -- once we take some machinery down there, we
22 will have to deal with what comes up. And if we see
23 things that are unusual that our work plan didn't
24 anticipate, we'll be calling Bob and Jim and ask them to
25 come down and look at the hole and help us draft an

1 on-the-spot solution.

2 MR. BERMAN: I was actually more concerned with
3 possible -- something of archeological interest, or --

4 MR. FORD: If we see anything like that, we'll
5 just throw it out in the deep water. We will actually
6 have archeological folks either monitoring full time or
7 on immediate call to come out and look. You know, that
8 is an issue because the west end of that riprap pile has
9 got columns that we presume are from the Panama Pacific
10 Exhibition. So the contract does include provisions that
11 we can tell the contractor to stop anytime we want. If
12 we find anything that appears to be of archeological
13 significance, we will tell them to stop, and we will get
14 the archeologist out to look at it. I hope we don't find
15 anything because I don't need that complication; but if
16 we do, we'll have to get the archeologist in and we'll
17 follow their recommendation. I'm finished. I'll stop.

18 MS. COATS: All right. Time for groundwater.
19 I'd like to introduce myself for those who don't know me.
20 My name is Jennifer Coats, and I work with the Presidio
21 Trust. And tonight I'd just like to present an
22 introductory overview of the groundwater monitoring
23 program. Quarterly we will issue a document that looks
24 like this. This is our quarterly report. It looks very
25 forbidding, but it's not. I'll just run through some

1 slides that show the field collections of the data, and
2 then we'll take a look at the report and how to find what
3 you might be interested in it.

4 This is a diagram, a profile diagram of a monitoring
5 well. I agree that it is not the world's greatest
6 diagram of monitoring wells, and it probably is difficult
7 to see. Basically, first of all, the objectives of the
8 groundwater monitoring program: Monitor the lateral and
9 vertical extent of any contamination at the Presidio and
10 evaluate whether remedial objectives are being met and
11 provide information on any strategies that may need to be
12 changed.

13 This work is done in accordance with state
14 requirements using monitoring wells. So here we are at
15 the monitoring wells. In this diagram, which is
16 terrible, the darker portion represents soil -- this is
17 the ground surface, this casing with a screen pipe. And
18 groundwater flows through the slotted portion. So as we
19 go through the report through the sampling, we will be at
20 the well, and we'll be installing equipment to come down
21 to this screen portion -- this is where the groundwater
22 is -- to collect our samples. This may be kind of basic,
23 but I just made a chart.

24 MR. BERMAN: What's the diameter of the bore?

25 MS. COATS: Typically, the well itself where

1 the screen portion is at the Presidio are typically
 2 two-inch wells. There's two standard sizes here at the
 3 Presidio, either two-inch or four-inch. And this is
 4 typically installed in a 12-inch boring. So on the side
 5 this is sand, to keep the screen clean so the water moves
 6 through and silt doesn't accumulate. And then above it,
 7 it's sealed off with a betanite seal so you can target a
 8 specific zone (INAUDIBLE) and then grounded to the
 9 surface. And this is the access point to get to the well
 10 which is locked. We keep these secured.

11 MR. FORD: One of the things we've learned is
 12 that the human being has an irrational urge to shove beer
 13 cans down monitoring wells. The four-inch well pipes are
 14 big enough that you can actually fit an aluminum can down
 15 them. I can tell you, if you ever have a four-inch well
 16 and you leave the casing unlocked for more than two days,
 17 some yahoo will find it and drop a beer can down it.
 18 Once that happens, you've got a problem because it's very
 19 difficult to get it back out. You can't use the well to
 20 monitor while there is a beer can in there. We try to be
 21 very careful about locking monitors.

22 MR. KERN: Do you monitor for the different
 23 kinds of beer?

24 MR. FORD: I have a collection. Good beer you
 25 have to go through the project manager to take home.

1 MS. COATS: That's a requirement. We have to
 2 take it back.

3 So this is what a monitoring well looks like.

4 MR. BERMAN: Typically, how much water do you
 5 actually take out in a monitoring sample?

6 MS. COATS: I can go through that when we get
 7 to the report part. Each well is a little different
 8 depending on the size and the amount of water in it.
 9 We'll go through the parameters.

10 MR. BERMAN: I didn't want -- just a rough
 11 answer -- you take out a pint, a gallon?

12 MS. COATS: Like three volumes. Three casing
 13 volumes of what is in the wells. And that assures that
 14 you're getting representative samples of what's going
 15 through and not stagnant water that's --

16 MR. BERMAN: Four gallons?

17 MR. FORD: I was going to say, for a two-inch
 18 well, you're talking about probably less than five
 19 gallons. For a four-inch well, it would be a significant
 20 quantity of water. It could be 50 to 100 gallons
 21 sometimes for a four-inch-deep well.

22 MS. COATS: This is one of my favorite wells.
 23 This is what a well looks like. This kind of also
 24 illustrates that the wells are located in different
 25 settings of the Presidio, so there's consideration of

1 nesting birds, native plants which goes into the
 2 sampling. Those issues are also discussed in the report.
 3 And you could see the (INAUDIBLE). This is one of my
 4 favorite cat toys.

5 Next slide. At the beginning of the Groundwater
 6 Sampling Program, we collect water level measurements.
 7 And we collect the measurement in all the wells on the
 8 Presidio on the same day, so we basically get a snapshot
 9 of the depth of the water at each site. Why do we
 10 collect water level measurements? This is to create the
 11 flow map so we know each site, which direction and
 12 potentially what the flow rate is through the different
 13 remediation sides to help characterize what we need to
 14 do. You could see the instrument he's using is the water
 15 level indicator. Basically you put the water level
 16 indicator in the well, and you go down until you find the
 17 water.

18 Next slide, please. Treadwell and Rollo is our
 19 groundwater monitoring contractor for the report
 20 preparation, but for the field services we use Blain Tech
 21 Services which is a specialty firm. And they have these
 22 wonderful trucks that are outfitted with everything we
 23 need for groundwater sampling which makes it very
 24 efficient to drive to different well locations, and they
 25 have everything you need.

1 You can see this particular gentleman is purging a
 2 well. Now by purging -- this is what we talked about
 3 earlier -- where you remove the groundwater that's in the
 4 casing so you can collect a fresh sample -- with the
 5 setup they have in the truck -- this is so cool -- they
 6 have tanks on the truck and they'll drive to our central
 7 staging area where we hold the water and collect the
 8 water. He has his cones set up for site delineation, for
 9 visitor safety on the Presidio where we're sampling.

10 Coolers on the back. Once samples are collected,
 11 they're immediately placed in coolers with ice for sample
 12 preservation. This is part of our chain of custody
 13 procedures and quality assurance procedures to maintain
 14 consistency amongst the samples.

15 Next slide please. Blain Tech trucks are also
 16 outfitted with a de-con unit. It's very important that
 17 between the well sampling points the equipment for both
 18 purging and sampling is thoroughly decontaminated so
 19 there's no cross-contamination. Also when we sample, we
 20 sample in order of typically cleanest well to dirtiest
 21 well to reduce the potential for contamination.

22 Next slide. How do you physically get the water out
 23 of the ground? This is just showing installation of a
 24 pump into a well. (INAUDIBLE) the pump in. Not very
 25 exciting, but I wanted to get that in.

1 Next slide. As the well is sampled, we collect data
2 on the water quality, the pH, temperature, dissolved
3 oxygen. And that's recorded on a field log which again
4 is included in the quarterly report, and some of the
5 instrumentation used to collect these parameters as a
6 sample. There is a tremendous amount of documentation
7 that goes with a sampling. It's not just a matter of run
8 out, put the water in a bottle and come back. There's
9 procedures that are followed. This is useful if there is
10 a hit; we can go back and look at the steps to see if
11 there was a cross-contamination problem or where the
12 problem may be.

13 MR. PONTON: How often do they calibrate their
14 equipment?

15 MS. COATS: The equipment, I believe, we do
16 have an equipment calibration sheet in here. I think
17 it's daily. Another point, we have sampling crews. So
18 we reduce the sampling time. There's three different
19 crews operating at the same time. They would each
20 calibrate on the same day. As far as a report review, a
21 lot of it is the documentation that goes behind the
22 sample collection, and it is presented here if you wish
23 to look at it.

24 MR. BERMAN: Is the evaluation done right on
25 the site?

1 during our quarterly sampling if you'd like to observe
2 the procedures. You can see what's going on. This is
3 about as exciting as it is right now.

4 MR. BERMAN: In a low-flow sampling, about how
5 deep is the well? In dealing with the low-flow
6 condition, how deep is the well?

7 MS. COATS: They can vary. Typically, they're
8 shallower wells. The pump isn't large enough or big
9 enough to carry it that far. You wouldn't use it for a
10 deeper well. So they're typically shallow wells.

11 MR. FORD: I don't think -- a peristaltic pump
12 can't lift more than 28 feet I think for (INAUDIBLE)
13 application. It has to be less than 28 feet to the
14 groundwater surface.

15 MR. BERMAN: For all sampling, or just the
16 low-flow? I thought the low-flow was probably not very
17 deep. I'm just guessing.

18 MS. COATS: Right.

19 MR. BERMAN: So is 28 feet the maximum depth
20 for even the most deepest well?

21 MS. COATS: No.

22 MR. FORD: Below 28 feet, you can't use a
23 peristaltic pump. You have to use a different kind of
24 pump to bring the water up.

25 MS. COATS: But we're fortunate we don't have

1 MS. COATS: The evaluation of the water quality
2 -- one of the goals when you're purging is to make sure
3 you have a representative sample of the aquifers to the
4 stabilization parameters. So once you see the pH and the
5 temperature and the (INAUDIBLE) of oxygen, you're kind of
6 getting similar readings and you've achieved the
7 calculated estimated volume (INAUDIBLE). You're
8 confident that you have a representative sample.

9 MR. BERMAN: There's no more analysis that's
10 done?

11 MS. COATS: Not in --

12 MR. BERMAN: Then it goes on to a lab from
13 there?

14 MS. COATS: Yes. Next slide please.

15 In the document, there's two types of purging that
16 are mentioned: the normal and the low flow. And this
17 just shows what the low-flow purge is. It's a lower
18 rate, using a different type of pump, peristaltic pump.
19 And this is used at wells where it can't maintain a
20 higher purge rate. So you want to get the sample, but
21 you don't want to dry it out so you pump it slower. In
22 the text, it's mentioned low-flow purge. I just wanted
23 to illustrate that.

24 The equipment in use in the field -- typical site
25 setup. I encourage anybody who's interested to come out

1 that particular problem on this particular site. Next
2 slide please.

3 Okay. LIV sampling. I needed the acronym LIV
4 because we love to use acronym. Actually there's an
5 acronym list at the beginning of the document. LIV: low
6 impact vehicle. This is what we use to access sites in
7 the Presidio in sensitive areas such as education,
8 limited access and it's kind of a neat unit. It's
9 self-contained; generator to the pump motor, buckets for
10 the sample, a little tank to hold the purge water. And
11 they just drive right over and have their equipment and
12 go. Next slide.

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is that Blain Tech too?

14 MS. COATS: Yes, it is. Blain Tech performs
15 all the -- This just shows it in progress. Purge two
16 coming over to the little purge tank sampling. That's
17 the controller for the rate that you pump. All the water
18 is transferred to Central Magazine area to (INAUDIBLE)
19 tanks. We sample it, and then once we receive the
20 results, we discharge through our sanitary sewer
21 discharge permit (INAUDIBLE).

22 And this is a photo of our lovely quarterly report.
23 It's being elongated, so it looks bigger than it is.
24 It's not that bad. I hope everybody has seen a copy of
25 this. We distribute it to Mark and Doug, the quarterly

1 reports, and also there's copies in our library if you'd
2 like to look at it.

3 But a quick summary of how it's presented. I think
4 it's actually a very concise presentation of a lot of
5 data, and it's easy to use. In the beginning there is a
6 general summary of the activities of the quarter, the
7 sampling activities, any abnormalities which is only this
8 thick.

9 Tables. One of the things we've introduced to the
10 Groundwater Monitoring Program is a concept of a Table 1.
11 And this table lists all the wells in our sampling
12 programs and all the analytes in each well. This is
13 distributed prior to the groundwater sampling so
14 everybody has a chance to review it and make sure any
15 concerns are incorporated. Any new wells that we add to
16 the program through our remediation work, (like the
17 Landfill E; we were discussing installation of new
18 wells), will be incorporated at this table, listed in
19 (INAUDIBLE) and the analytical suite that we're proposing
20 to sample for will also be highlighted.

21 So this is Table 1. It's a quick summary when you
22 first open the document, if you're interested in a
23 particular area, you can look and see what was sampled
24 for. It's just one place you can look for information.

25 Figures. Basic first figure is just the groundwater

1 couple of the sites, there are concentration maps where
2 there are chemicals found, concentration maps so you can
3 look at, if you're a visual person and you like to look
4 at a map.

5 So there's three different types of presentations of
6 the same data, so whichever you feel more comfortable
7 using, it's right here.

8 And it's probably each -- it's kind of like our QC
9 steps that I talked about before -- collecting duplicate
10 samples, recording observations in the field -- that data
11 presented as well, the field sheets. So if there is an
12 anomalous result, we can look at the field sheets and
13 maybe determine the problem.

14 MR. BERMAN: The actual list of analytes, is
15 that something that is specific to the Presidio or is it
16 a general (INAUDIBLE)?

17 MS. COATS: The table we presented bring out
18 each site, and the monitoring requirements, the
19 analytical suite at the various sites, differ depending
20 on the former use of the sites or anything that's been
21 found during remedial investigations.

22 One thing we tried to do in this program which was a
23 little bit different from the Army Program is, it's not
24 only well-specific, but if there is adjacent wells or
25 adjacent sites where you might (INAUDIBLE) the background

1 basins of the Presidio and all the wells. I didn't have
2 a copy of this. It would never show up, but it's very
3 interesting to look at.

4 MR. BERMAN: How many wells are there in total?

5 MS. COATS: Currently, I think there's 127-ish
6 to date, but there's going to be more.

7 And now we get to the best part. What we call
8 Appendix A is a summary of each of the sites. There is
9 20 different monitoring sites, and they each have their
10 own little appendix number. So for each site that you
11 may be interested in reviewing, there is really only
12 about this much data. I encourage people to use this and
13 look at it. It's a lot of money and a lot of effort, and
14 there is a lot of good data in here. It's a good tool
15 for the Remediation Program.

16 For one of the sites, we began with a text summary
17 of the sampling results. So there is just quick verbiage
18 about what was discovered, what was done, presented in
19 text format. And then if you're the kind of person who
20 likes to look at tables like myself, there's tables of
21 the data starting with a recent sampling round and then a
22 presentation of all the historical data. So you can look
23 for trends in sampling (INAUDIBLE).

24 And then, site figures that show the potential
25 metric maps from our water level sampling. And for a

1 or comparison they have the same sampling. So you can
2 compare adjacent --

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: There is no state-wide
4 typical.

5 MR. FORD: Right. It's all site-specific.

6 MR. BERMAN: So someone decides, a human being
7 then decides that at a given site, "I'll select this
8 analytical suite," and that's it.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right. And that's what's in
10 Table 1, that choice.

11 MR. BERMAN: So, I mean, the person who does
12 this presumably takes a wide enough spectrum so that
13 you're sure that you have not left anything out.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: And typically you don't keep
15 that wide spectrum forever, because you demonstrated it's
16 not there, that the whole type of analyte may not be
17 pure. You may not have any pesticide at a different
18 site. And so you would be -- demonstrated they are not
19 there, and quit testing for them. And certain types of
20 sites, like petroleum sites, you would not expect
21 certain things. You wouldn't test for them.

22 MR. BERMAN: So the analytical suite is
23 essentially a professional judgment call for each well
24 which hopefully gets reduced in size over time?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes.

Page 57

1 MS. COATS: This is what we proposed to
2 stakeholders and regulatory agencies. Once there is
3 approval given, that's what we sample for.

4 MR. BOGGS: Some of those sampling protocols
5 actually have a pretty broad range of protocols set up
6 for automatically. For example, if there is an
7 underground waste oil tank, we've got to look for PCBs
8 and solvents and petroleum products just as a part of
9 naturally what they would monitor for. After that, if
10 you continue to not find something, after a couple years
11 of monitoring, then presumably you no longer need to
12 monitor it.

13 MS. COATS: That's basically it. I just wanted
14 to present this is what it is; these are the easy ways to
15 look at it and glean information you're looking for. Any
16 particular questions?

17 MR. KERN: Can you give us a general estimate
18 as to what the cost of collection and reporting is
19 quarterly, just ballpark?

20 MS. COATS: It's expensive. The largest
21 component of the testing is the analytical testing. So
22 that's the biggest dollar amount, is the physical
23 sampling analysis. I'd have to double check to see.

24 MR. FORD: It's about \$80,000 a month. It's
25 just under a million dollars a year right now. So a

Page 59

1 everybody, people within the Trust or anyone else who's
2 interested.

3 MR. PONTON: When does the next report come
4 out?

5 MS. COATS: Tonight. So pick up your copy
6 before you leave. This is Third Quarter 2001. And we
7 just completed Quarter One 2002 sampling. We started
8 that the week of March 4th. The field activities' been
9 done, and we're analyzing.

10 MR. COOPER: So you're issuing Third Quarter
11 2001 tonight?

12 MS. COATS: Yes.

13 MR. COOPER: So you're pretty much getting
14 caught up?

15 MS. COATS: And Quarter Four is the annual
16 Summary Report, so the next one will be the big one that
17 summarizes any trends we've observed or changes. Anybody
18 have any questions?

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Do these costs go into the
20 deductible for the insurance costs?

21 MR. FORD: I think they do. We have a new cost
22 recovery program, so when you pick up your copy of the
23 report tonight, we'd like you to give us a check for
24 \$25,000 per copy.

25 MS. COATS: Please use it.

Page 58

1 quarterly report is just under \$250,000 to take the
2 samples, do the analysis, write the draft report and get
3 a final. So you can see it's something that we pay close
4 attention to because we don't want to be spending that
5 kind of money any longer than we have to. If we have a
6 site that achieves a steady state with cleanup levels, we
7 want to document that and kind of get it off the list as
8 soon as we can to try to squeeze that cost down.

9 MR. KERN: Is there a database that's updated
10 regularly that you guys all have access to to determine
11 analyses?

12 MR. FORD: Montgomery Watson is going to be
13 putting that together for us over the last year and a
14 half, but we're also in the process of bringing that
15 database management function in-house. It seems like
16 it's going to be better to have the data live right in
17 the Trust.

18 MR. KERN: Is it easily -- is that something
19 that if someone here wanted to do an analysis at a
20 particular site, you can request data for a site, or is
21 it not easy to do?

22 MR. FORD: At the moment, I don't think it's
23 particularly easy, but we hope that roughly within a
24 couple of months it will be easy. So that's where we've
25 helped is to try to make the data more accessible to

Page 60

1 MR. PONTON: Where are they?

2 MS. COATS: Where are they tonight?

3 MR. PONTON: The ones that we're taking with
4 us.

5 MS. COATS: Back there.

6 MR. KERN: So you'll get the bill for analyzing
7 the report?

8 MR. FORD: I hadn't thought about that. Let me
9 get back to you on that. You know, you could just give
10 us an IOU.

11 MR. KERN: Well thank you to everyone for those
12 reports. Any questions on these? Let's go to Bob and
13 Jim if you have any comments.

14 MR. BOGGS: Sorry I wasn't here for the first
15 part, but I kind-of followed the project status outline,
16 and I'd like to make a few points about where DTSC is
17 with regard to some of these topics.

18 One of the first things was the FS and the cleanup
19 levels. As of today, we have partial resolution on some
20 of those. There's still going to be a couple issues
21 outstanding.

22 Where the resolution resolved was regarding some
23 ecological cleanup levels. There was a discussion
24 between Ppb highs and Ppb lows were no effects in the
25 low-effects range. We've got some resolved to some of

1 those. Some of those it's going to resolve to what our
2 detection limit is, how we can reasonably detect these
3 things in the environment.

4 A couple of the outstanding issues that still need
5 to be resolved are regarding a mercury cleanup level,
6 residential PCB cleanup level. The Trust has proposed a
7 1 Ppm cleanup level which is based on regulatory guidance
8 called TSCA, Toxic Substances Control Act.

9 MR. BERMAN: With mercury, are you talking
10 about that 1 PPM?

11 MR. BOGGS: No. Mercury is considered -- the
12 Trust has proposed -- I think it's really close to that
13 1.6 to 1.8 parts per million. We have a little but --
14 and that's for an ecological cleanup level -- we have a
15 little bit of a concern with that, particularly because
16 the highest that was ever measured in background here at
17 the Presidio was 0.2. And so if we have anything above
18 that, it's most likely from a source of contamination, a
19 man-made source. If we were near the Quicksilver Mine in
20 San Jose/Palo Alto area, we wouldn't be as concerned
21 about that cleanup level. So there is still going to be
22 some hemming and hawing back between the Ppb low, which
23 is 0.4, twice as high as what was ever detected in the
24 background sample, which is what DTSC would propose, and
25 the 1.6 proposed by the Trust. It's not a big

1 difference. And it's not -- it shouldn't make a big
2 difference in the number of scoops of soil at any site.

3 MR. BERMAN: Is there a TSCA number?

4 MR. BOGGS: TSCA? Not for mercury. The
5 mercury number was based on two different ecological
6 values that were discussed. The PCV values based on a
7 regulatory value comes under federal regs by the Trust
8 and the human health risk-based value. Like when they do
9 the risk assessment for all the other contaminants, if
10 they ran it through for PCBs, it would most likely come
11 out somewhere around 0.22. The TSCA cleanup level, which
12 is a regulatory number, is 1.0 milligrams per kilogram.
13 Again, we're not talking about big differences in
14 numbers.

15 And then another thing that needs to be resolved is
16 residential lead cleanup numbers. In the Trust table,
17 they had put a number of 400. Similarly, if you run
18 through the states what they call lead spread model,
19 which is how they calculate lead risk, you get 370 --
20 roughly 370 -- and the Trust has proposed a cleanup level
21 of 400, which is also another federal number that relates
22 to 400. So again, the State is pushing for the
23 risk-based number of 370.

24 There is a little caveat to those numbers in that
25 that number of 370 that comes under a risk assessment is

1 based on an average concentration. So that 370 would be
2 an average. Whereas the Trust has proposed for doing
3 lead-based paint they would have a ceiling, a bright line
4 of 400. Anything above 400 would be excavated. You can
5 tell that if you excavated anything over 400, you're
6 average is almost always going to be well below 370. And
7 so there is not as much of an issue there as much as a
8 concern of how we're going to agree to that in a RAP or a
9 legal document to have some sort of language, even though
10 the 400 could be used as a bright line -- although the
11 average of all samples would be below 370.

12 So those are the final last three little minor
13 issues to get resolved regarding cleanup levels, and then
14 we should be moving forward with that.

15 MR. BERMAN: You can't handle this little
16 detail by specifying a max-to-min ratio?

17 MR. BOGGS: Well, the difficulty in that lies
18 -- it's partly from management all down. We have to have
19 a regulatory basis for what we decide. So there is
20 actually a regulatory basis for defining those cleanup
21 levels as an average. It's actually 95 percent UCL of
22 the mean. That's what we require them to use in their
23 risk assessment so that we're comparing apples and
24 apples. There's a regulatory basis for saying those
25 cleanup levels represent the 95 percent UCL mean. Well

1 it just -- you can't really grasp that number out in the
2 field when you're trying to dig up, and you get one
3 sample that's above this number.

4 MR. BERMAN: That's right. That's why I
5 thought a max-to-min ratio might be a simple way of
6 solving it.

7 MR. BOGGS: Could be, but unfortunately, the
8 statistics of that 95 percent of UCL mean may or may not
9 lead itself to defining a range. Now the Trust has gone
10 forward and tried proposing 400 as a bright line, when
11 the average only needs to be 370.

12 Our risk assessors think that's very conservative.
13 They are not in disagreement with that. We just need to
14 have it specified that that 400 is a bright line, whereas
15 those other numbers, we're not requiring them to say that
16 that's a bright line. So they either have to propose 370
17 as a UCL or the 400 as a bright line. It's just a matter
18 of coming to an agreement.

19 MR. BERMAN: Was the 1 Ppm for mercury,
20 elemental mercury?

21 MR. BOGGS: Actually, the 1 Ppm is for PCBs.

22 MR. BERMAN: Okay. 1.6 rather, it was. Is
23 that elemental?

24 MR. BOGGS: Correct. Total. So it could be
25 ionic or elemental.

Page 65

1 MR. BERMAN: Oh, I see. So it covers it.

2 MR. BOGGS: Yeah. It's solved like that
3 mercury is solved. It would also be 1 Ppm.

4 To get back to following this, and just a status
5 update. We met regarding Landfill E. We have a -- DTSC
6 is going to make a couple of minor recommendations to the
7 scope being performed at Landfill E.

8 Contingency Plan. My management's pretty much in
9 agreement that we'll try and work with the Trust to
10 expedite the Contingency Plan.

11 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. We sent out some
12 comments today that are just draft comments. They're not
13 requiring a response from the Trust because we know
14 they're generating updated documents.

15 LAIR. We give verbal approval yesterday and sent
16 out comments today approving -- they kind-of modified the
17 scope of the work they're doing there, and they're
18 proposing to deal with some low levels of pesticides that
19 they found.

20 Mountain Lake is moving forward. We have a meeting
21 set up for next week. The Army Corp of Engineers called
22 today and they're eager to get involved.

23 Skeet Range Approval happened a week or two ago.
24 Building 937 we just got a letter on today, so that will
25 be moving forward very quickly.

Page 67

1 of items on the agenda because it's pretty
2 straightforward what we're going to discuss with Mountain
3 Lake.

4 One of the first things that we'll be doing is
5 basically giving a summary of the investigations to date,
6 kind of putting forth why we think all the PRPs that have
7 been invited are PRPs. Then we'll be proposing a few
8 ideas on how the project should move forward. And then
9 DTSC kind-of steps out of it, and it's really kind of
10 incumbent upon the PRPs to decide how they want to
11 proceed. We can give some guidelines and help assist the
12 thing, but it's really their agreement on how they want
13 to proceed that will (INAUDIBLE).

14 But if they feel they need to do more investigation
15 to decide what percentages, who pays for what, I wouldn't
16 be surprised if that takes place. It may be they decide
17 there is enough information already, and they can come up
18 with some equitable agreement.

19 MR. BERMAN: Have you issued any kind of
20 marching orders to the PRPs to be prepared with that kind
21 of information?

22 MR. BOGGS: No. We're this week going to send
23 out a draft agenda to all the people participating and
24 invite them to add or subtract from the agenda as they
25 see fit, but not for the initial meeting. It was hard

Page 66

1 And lastly, just a couple things. The DTSC has on
2 its priority list -- we had a management meeting last
3 Thursday. Management from Sacramento came down.

4 One of the things that the community has been
5 concerned about was a schedule. My management, when the
6 issue was explained to him, also became very concerned.
7 So my management is going to be eagerly looking for a
8 nice schedule from the Trust.

9 Also one of the issues that's kind of been on the
10 side plate, but is a concern of our management, is a RAP
11 ROD for lead and soil around (INAUDIBLE) lead-based
12 paint. There has been some work going on that the Trust
13 has been doing cleaning up lead-based paint and soil, and
14 we're not in disagreement with how they've been doing it
15 or how the cleanup levels they're -- the cleanup levels
16 they're cleaning up to -- but they haven't gotten all the
17 proper approvals to do that work yet as far as a RAP ROD.
18 So my management's concern is that they're doing that
19 work without an approved plan yet, although how they're
20 doing it we will generally approve of. It is their
21 concern that they want to get those documents in place
22 and approved. Any questions?

23 MR. BERMAN: Are you preparing the agenda for
24 the meeting next week?

25 MR. BOGGS: Correct. There actually not a lot

Page 68

1 enough to get CalTrans to come to the table. It wasn't
2 until the second letter from our legal department that
3 they decided to show up.

4 So the first one is just to make the introductions,
5 and ideally if we can get marching orders, a plan for how
6 we're going to move forward, that would be the most
7 opportunistic plan.

8 MR. BERMAN: Are you going to chair the
9 meeting?

10 MR. BOGGS: Yeah.

11 MR. BERMAN: So would you have a few ideas on
12 how you would like to proceed, if there's a vacuum that
13 is created after you (INAUDIBLE)?

14 MR. BOGGS: Oh, yes. And we'll also have a
15 follow-up plan if the PRPs are unable to come to an
16 agreement. That's generally how it's done is we give the
17 PRPs a chance to tackle what's their responsibility. If
18 they are unable to do it, we actually have several legal
19 mechanisms to make sure things happen and take place.
20 It's generally more costly to the PRPs if we go through
21 it. It's in their favor to come to an agreement to
22 proceed.

23 MR. KERN: Jim, do you have anything?

24 MR. PONTON: No.

25 MR. KERN: We're nearing the end of the

Page 69

1 meeting. I want to be considerate of our reporter.
 2 She's been going now for a couple of hours. I want to
 3 make sure -- we could either take a break if we intend to
 4 spend a good amount of time on this item No. 7, or if it
 5 looks like we're kind of close to the end, I think we
 6 could just wrap up.

7 Do you have a feel for this Item No. 7? Between the
 8 two of us, we had a discussion at the RAB committee
 9 meeting about schedules. One of our members presented a
 10 potential plan. Is there any comments that you guys
 11 would like to make about that, or should we talk about
 12 this a little bit, take a little break, or is it quick?

13 MR. FORD: Well, I guess what I have to add
 14 about the schedule is pretty quick. I don't know whether
 15 that will generate more discussion.

16 MR. KERN: Let's give it shot and see.

17 MR. FORD: At the committee meeting a couple of
 18 weeks ago, Dave Sutter put forth a proposal that the
 19 Trust basically do a critical-path schedule and get
 20 somebody, get essentially an outside -- contract out the
 21 management of the schedule. And we agree with his
 22 proposal. In fact, we agree with it so much, we've been
 23 working furiously since October to try to do it that way.
 24 We're closing in on it, but we're not there.

25 The schedule used to be maintained for us by EKI.

Page 70

1 That didn't work very well. We have brought the
 2 scheduling function in-house at the moment, mostly
 3 through the great amount of help that we got from Brian
 4 and Laura at the Park Service. They basically built a
 5 draft schedule for us and then gave it to us. We have
 6 not done the best job of advancing the draft schedule the
 7 last couple of steps to a final schedule, but we are
 8 working on that. We owe Bob and Jim a schedule. We will
 9 be issuing an updated schedule by next Friday, whatever
 10 day that is.

11 MR. PONTON: Is that the same schedule that
 12 you're talking about?

13 MR. FORD: It's an updated version of the
 14 schedule. One of the things about the schedule is that
 15 we update it quarterly, and the way projects evolve
 16 around here, I mean, a lot of stuff changes in a quarter.
 17 The updating isn't trivial.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Did you come up with a master
 19 schedule?

20 MR. FORD: Yes. It's a big schedule. It now
 21 has close to 1800 lines in it. I was looking at it this
 22 morning. It includes all of the projects that we know
 23 about. But anyhow, we're trying to work out the details
 24 of how we're going to manage the scheduling function
 25 in-house. We haven't worked out all the details, but we

Page 71

1 hope to over the next couple of weeks. So I guess what I
 2 would say is from the Trust perspective, Dave's proposal
 3 is a good one, and we're taking it to heart as quickly as
 4 we can. We've made some progress down that road.

5 I think the other item here as far as financial
 6 reporting, if I can just jump to that quickly. The Trust
 7 is planning to give a financial summary. We thought it
 8 would be tonight, but Tom Kingston wasn't available to
 9 give it, and the Trust is going through some
 10 reorganization right now which has made it a little more
 11 difficult for to us get our financial reporting stuff put
 12 out in time. But we will plan to give a summary at the
 13 next RAB meeting.

14 MR. COOPER: How often would the RAB like to
 15 hear financial updates, how money is spent -- quarterly,
 16 semi-annually, or --

17 MR. KERN: I won't speak for the entire
 18 membership, but I can say that since we have never had a
 19 regular reporting, you can't really err on the side of
 20 too frequent to kind-of get started. We can do it every
 21 single meeting if you can, and then we'll say, "Oh, well,
 22 that's too much."

23 MR. COOPER: Are you interested in amount spent
 24 per project, bottom-line, amount spent, admin versus on
 25 project-specific tasks, or -- Tom did one presentation

Page 72

1 already. Is that type of table what you were looking
 2 for, or -- We can talk about this off-line, what type of
 3 -- when we do these financial reports, I want to make
 4 sure we're presenting information that you're interested
 5 in.

6 MR. KERN: I think we could give you more
 7 detail off-line, but it's hard to comment on what Tom
 8 presented because he would flash a viewgraph and then
 9 pull it off. We can give you some detail.

10 MS. YAROS: We certainly would think of amount
 11 per site.

12 MR. KERN: Yeah. On a project basis.

13 MR. BERMAN: Could we take that on as an agenda
 14 item for the next committee meeting?

15 MR. COOPER: That's a good idea.

16 MR. KERN: Okay. Thank you, George.

17 On the agenda, we see there are some
 18 recently-released documents that were mentioned, and I
 19 think there is going to be a groundwater monitoring
 20 report released as well.

21 Looking at the review of the action items, Item
 22 No. 8, there is the opportunity to go out and witness the
 23 groundwater monitoring as it happens. And do you know
 24 what date that is going to be?

25 MS. COATS: That is currently not scheduled,

Page 73

1 but when we submit the table, we will (INAUDIBLE)
 2 MR. FORD: (INAUDIBLE) sampling start date,
 3 maybe where they might want to (INAUDIBLE)
 4 MR. KERN: We've heard tonight that there's
 5 going be a schedule out in a week. We're going to work
 6 on the financial summary, some of the ideas of what we'd
 7 like to see at the next committee meeting. We understand
 8 the Cleanup Level Document is close. There's the three
 9 items to be worked out between the DTSC and the Trust.
 10 And hopefully that will become final, and then that will
 11 be included in Landfill 4/Fill Site 5. And the
 12 bulldozers will be out there instead of October, in June.
 13 As usual, the agenda items should be relayed to
 14 Mark, if you have any coming up. Are there any other
 15 final announcements before we close tonight? Yes.
 16 Please.
 17 MS. RYAN: I have a request. I've been
 18 changing offices, so I haven't had access to Email in
 19 over a week, and I spent a half hour trying to find this
 20 meeting this evening because I went to the Golden Gate
 21 Club, Log Cabin, Baker Beach and then finally the offices
 22 of the Trust where someone looked on their computer and
 23 it said the Golden Gate Club. So I finally found you,
 24 but I think it's really important -- I know in the past,
 25 you always put signs out at the major intersections. And

Page 74

1 that's really important because you want to encourage
 2 public involvement and not just people on our Email list.
 3 So if you could reinstitute that habit of putting out
 4 signs, it would be really helpful, I think.
 5 MS. PACKER: There usually are signs. But I
 6 noticed that tonight as I was driving up, and I think our
 7 people forget. Usually they are out there, so I'm make
 8 sure they're out there.
 9 MS. RYAN: Thank you.
 10 MS. PACKER: From now on, we've moved here.
 11 We've moved from the Golden Gate Club. But I will make
 12 sure that signs are out.
 13 MR. BERMAN: I would like to express my
 14 personal thanks to -- when I received a letter from Bruce
 15 and Craig Middleton on the ARARs that the ARARs problem
 16 had been settled. It brought a great smile, and I wanted
 17 to thank any people here that were involved in helping
 18 bring that about because it certainly looked like it was
 19 a dark cloud in the sky for a while, and I'm personally
 20 very appreciative, and I'm sure that the other members of
 21 the RAB are happy to see the resolution of that and the
 22 broadness of the concept that's been initiated by
 23 (INAUDIBLE).
 24 MR. KERN: Thank you. Any other announcements
 25 or comments? Thank you very much for coming out tonight.

Page 75

1 Meeting adjourned.
 2 (The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.)
 3 ---oOo---
 4 RAB MEMBERS
 5 Sam Berman
 6 Bob Boggs, DTSC
 7 Edward Callahan
 8 Jennifer Coats, Presidio Trust
 9 Craig Cooper
 10 George Ford, Presidio Trust
 11 Julian Hultgren
 12 Doug Kern
 13 Jane Packer, Presidio Trust
 14 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
 15 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
 16 Gloria Yaros
 17 Mark Youngkin
 18
 19 Others Present:
 20 Pat Ryan
 21 ---oOo---
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 76

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

THE OFFICER'S CLUB

BUILDING 50

MAY 14, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

COPYREPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

Page 3

1 We had a short discussion on the ARARs and the
2 resolution of that issue. We also talked about the
3 remediation schedule, financial reporting. And we
4 discussed a little bit on the template for financial
5 reporting. That looks about it. So our next meeting is
6 going to be on May 28th, Tuesday night. Hope you all
7 can attend. Thank you. Thank you, Mark. Our next
8 item, 5A, I'd like to personally welcome from the RAB
9 community members, the executive director of the
10 Presidio trust, Craig Middleton. Before we turn it over
11 to him -- Craig, do you want to do any further
12 introductions?

13 MR. COOPER: I know that Craig has been
14 working for the Presidio Trust for a long time and one
15 of the first employees. I guess in the short period of
16 time that I've been working with him, I've really
17 enjoyed the leadership and decision-making that he's
18 made. I'll let him take it from there as far as what
19 vision he has for the Presidio and the Remediation
20 Program in general.

21 MR. MIDDLETON: Thanks, Craig. You can hand
22 me the letter.

23 MR. FORD: We have to discuss it.

24 MR. MIDDLETON: Thank you for inviting me to
25 come tonight. It's been awhile. I don't when the last

Page 2

1 MR. KERN: Good evening. I would like to
2 welcome all of you to tonight's regularly-scheduled
3 Presidio Restoration Advisory Board meeting. I would
4 like to welcome everyone here tonight: The Presidio
5 Trust, their contractors, the Park Service, the
6 regulatory community, RAB community members and any
7 members of the public that are here tonight. Thank you
8 very much for coming out.

9 Does everyone have an agenda? Are there any
10 additions or changes tonight?

11 We do have a letter from the Restoration Advisory
12 Board to Mr. Craig Middleton that we want to review at
13 some point tonight, and hopefully send it off. So we'll
14 schedule that somewhere here. Maybe just after George's
15 5D.

16 Anything else. Any announcements? Old business?
17 Committee reports. Mark.

18 MS. YOUNG: Thank you. We had our Regular
19 Planning Committee meeting on April 23rd. We meet at
20 Building 1750 in the second floor meeting room. We
21 talked about several important topics that night. We
22 had a discussion on the changes in the environmental
23 program personnel, mainly the leaving of Jane Packer and
24 how to replace the functions that she was taking care
25 of.

Page 4

1 time I was at a RAB meeting, but it was not at this
2 room. It was at the Golden Gate Club with my former
3 boss Jim Meadows. Anyway, it's great to be here.

4 Just wanted to share with you an experience that I
5 had about two and a half weeks ago. I was in
6 Washington, DC. We happened to be in the hottest spring
7 ever in Washington DC. We were dripping wet at
8 97-degree weather. But my boss and I, Toby Rosenblatt,
9 the Chairman of the Board, went back just to talk to
10 members of Congress, as we do occasionally, and
11 virtually every senator, every member of Congress
12 (INAUDIBLE) asked under the circumstances asked us about
13 the environmental remediation (INAUDIBLE). And they
14 felt that it was very important that we succeed. They
15 felt that it was perhaps a model. The same way of doing
16 business was perhaps a model for other bases. I don't
17 know if it's true or not, but they think it is. So
18 there is a lot of pressure on us to succeed.

19 The other thing that you should know is that
20 everyone mentioned the RAB as a very constructive RAB
21 and model of how a RAB should be organized. So kudos go
22 to you and to all of you.

23 I just wanted to share that with you, and in doing
24 that, tell you what our perspective on this is and what
25 direction you take is extraordinarily important. The

DISK ENCLOSED

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

Page 5

1 role you play is extraordinarily important. Thank you.
 2 I know the volunteer time is a lot and I really
 3 appreciate it. Some of you I've seen from the last time
 4 I was here -- Julie, Mark and Doug.
 5 I wanted to also tell you about some -- you alluded
 6 to it earlier -- some organizational changes in the
 7 Trust and how that might affect what we're doing here.
 8 Obviously we have a new Executive Director, and I'm
 9 acting in that role now. I have made some changes to
 10 the staff that have two objectives in mind. One is to
 11 reduce costs. We reduced our operating costs 12 and a
 12 half percent about three weeks ago through staff
 13 reduction. And I also wanted to reduce the Admin. cost
 14 in the \$100,000,000 remediation program. (INAUDIBLE)
 15 the Admin cost has the potential of eating up too much
 16 of that hundred million dollars. And also to
 17 streamline the reporting structure.
 18 So a couple of the changes. Craig Cooper is now
 19 leading the program, he and George. Craig is reporting
 20 directly to me. The way it was before (INAUDIBLE, so
 21 we've decided to make it a clean reporting relationship,
 22 so it's direct to me. Hopefully that will help us with
 23 the decision making, and we can move things quickly.
 24 We've also eliminated three positions in the
 25 Environmental Remediation Group. Tom Kingston, Terry

Page 6

1 Carpenter and Jane Packer. I know Jane is somebody who
 2 you've worked with very closely. We all have great
 3 regard for her. I wanted to make sure you understand
 4 that eliminating that position was not intended in any
 5 way to undermine the role that the RAB plays. We're
 6 going to move part of our communications staff into that
 7 position, so that that role will be filled by someone in
 8 our communications staff.
 9 I think I would just like to emphasize that I think
 10 the success of this program is, simply put, is going to
 11 be in how fast we can put (INAUDIBLE) in the ground. So
 12 we had a long Board meeting today in which the topic of
 13 cleanup standards came up, and I think we went a long
 14 way toward getting shovels in the grounds today.
 15 (INAUDIBLE)
 16 We want to have 4 and 5 done this year, or at least
 17 started this year. And we want to get the Contingency
 18 Plan done and other stuff moving in the various RAPs. I
 19 appreciate the help of the regulators. I appreciate
 20 your help, Brian, and the Park Service. Brian was very
 21 helpful on the resolution of the ARARs issue a couple of
 22 weeks ago, and we appreciate that. I just wanted to say
 23 thank you, and if you have any questions, I'd be happy
 24 to answer.
 25 MR. KERN: Now is the chance. We have our

Page 7

1 professional questioner to open up.
 2 MR. BERMAN: I think we all felt a bit of a
 3 sting in the departure of Jane Packer because in a
 4 certain sense many of us who donate our time feel that
 5 the support that we got from Jane was very useful in
 6 some of the activities, especially in the newsletter,
 7 and some of the public outreach that we're trying to do
 8 in printed form as well as organizational activities
 9 that she helped us with. It's reassuring to hear that
 10 someone in the Communications Department will fill that
 11 role, but hopefully I'm expressing not only for myself
 12 but for the other members of the RAB that this person or
 13 persons be identified quickly so that we can get to know
 14 them, know the person, and get that role filled, because
 15 her departure was sudden and in the middle of some of
 16 the communications work that we were doing for public
 17 outreach. So hopefully that gap would be as short as
 18 possible and that we could have somebody perhaps even
 19 assigned in coming to the next small meeting that we
 20 have on the 28th, a more informal meeting than usual.
 21 There is no members of the public there. I think that
 22 would be reassuring to us to know that continuity would
 23 be maintained, and we'd get an opportunity to catch up
 24 on some of the things that are going on.
 25 MR. MIDDLETON: I will tell you that we will

Page 8

1 have someone assigned to that meeting on the 28th.
 2 Right?
 3 MR. COOPER: Right.
 4 MR. KERN: Can you give us any feel for how
 5 the Board is looking at the cleanup program? I know
 6 that Mary was instrumental in helping to get the money
 7 for this program. She remains actively involved. Which
 8 other members are active or perhaps involved?
 9 MR. MIDDLETON: Probably the two most active
 10 members are Mary and (INAUDIBLE) because of their
 11 expertise in the area. (INAUDIBLE) Everybody who was at
 12 the Board meeting was very interested and active. I
 13 think the main concern or hope is that we move it. We
 14 just move it quickly and get things done. That's really
 15 it. Ultimately get the job done.
 16 MS. YOUNG: Is there a search for a new
 17 director, or can we look forward to seeing you around
 18 for a while?
 19 MR. MIDDLETON: Knowing me, I'll probably be
 20 around here in one capacity or another. They are
 21 looking for a search firm, and they wanted to do a
 22 nationwide search. They have taken their time. In
 23 fact, they have not yet selected one. They have to do a
 24 job description and search, so I don't know how long. I
 25 don't think it will be anytime too soon.

Page 9

1 MS. YOUNG: Good.

2 MR. FORD: There are many of us within the
3 ranks of the Trust who are hoping that they do a
4 thorough nationwide search and afterwards would pick
5 this guy at the end. That's not sales talk. There are
6 a lot of people leaning that way. So we're crossing our
7 fingers.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: (INAUDIBLE) Mountain Lake and
9 Golden Gate Bridge Transit Authority and the finger
10 pointing that's been going on. Does the Board have any
11 opinion about that?

12 MR. MIDDLETON: Yeah. We talked a little bit
13 about that. You know the details of it, about Caltrans.

14 MR. COOPER: Right. We'll give a brief
15 update. Caltrans issued a letter this week, and we can
16 talk about that. Bob and I can talk about that. It was
17 a bit of a setback.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Push back, right?

19 MR. COOPER: A bit of a push back.

20 MR. MIDDLETON: We're looking to Bob for
21 guidance at this time.

22 MR. BOGGS: They timed it perfectly. Our
23 lawyer just left on vacation the day after we got the
24 letter. So we're looking to our legal department. A
25 lot of what was stated in the letter we don't feel is

Page 11

1 you use for the cuts, and at what point will we be able
2 to consider rehires? I work for the State and have to
3 estimate the income and the revenue from tax. I just
4 wondered what the basis was that you use at the Presidio
5 Trust.

6 MR. MIDDLETON: In general, there are a couple
7 of funding sources that we have, most of which are
8 dipped in because of the recession and September 11. We
9 have appropriated funds from Congress. The President
10 cut our requests by 1.2 million this year. I don't
11 think it was an attempt to cut us in particular. It's
12 just that they're putting money into airports, and
13 Homeland Security, and that kind of thing. The
14 recession has hit us. (INAUDIBLE) 5 percent of our
15 operating money comes from the federal government; the
16 rest of it comes from leases. And so the recession in
17 the early stage has hit us. We've seen about 15 percent
18 drops in our residential rents, and our nonresidential
19 (INAUDIBLE) we're not getting the business that we
20 anticipated. Also the treasury (INAUDIBLE) vie for
21 capital projects, and that money is starting to dry up.
22 We have a limited amount (INAUDIBLE). So all these
23 things added together result in a significant drop in
24 revenue, and we need to adjust. And so that's what
25 formed the basis of our cuts.

Page 10

1 accurate. It's positioning, etc. They made some
2 misstatements that they did in the letter.

3 So at this point, we're at another little hurdle
4 that needs to be addressed. It needs to be addressed on
5 the legal front. We'll be groveling in this one for a
6 little while, I think. Hopefully it will lead to a
7 relatively quick resolution. Lawyers have a way of
8 slowing things up. So we'll work with them and their
9 constraints and still try to move forward.

10 MR. BERMAN: Did you get a feeling that there
11 is a great fear by Caltrans that this is going to be a
12 possible precedent-setting case of which the potential
13 financial costs could be very high?

14 MR. BOGGS: Yes. That's one of their concerns
15 if they -- they're not just going to waltz forward and
16 say, "We have an open pocket of money," and just take
17 it. So the Department's dealt with Caltrans on a number
18 of similar issues on other sites. Brief discussions
19 with our legal department indicate that we've still got
20 a case, and we're moving forward. As an initial
21 response, this isn't uncommon for Caltrans. And then we
22 start to get into the details of where their liability
23 legally actually lies and how far that goes and doesn't
24 go. I wish we could just get to the outcome quicker.

25 MR. CALLAHAN: What is the fiscal basis that

Page 12

1 MR. CALLAHAN: So we would have to wait for an
2 increase in appropriations before considering rehiring.

3 MR. MIDDLETON: The other issue that played
4 into it was that we decided that we needed to move to
5 tighten up our operations in general (INAUDIBLE) just so
6 that we're not quite so dependent on federal
7 appropriations. I think we're in good shape now.
8 Unless the economy really takes a turn, we'll be doing
9 fine and then we can look at hiring. I've kept the
10 hiring freeze on except for a case-by-case basis.

11 MR. KERN: Other questions?

12 MS. CHEEVER: Are you optimistic after today's
13 Board meeting Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 really getting
14 started this year?

15 MR. MIDDLETON: Ask Bob. I think so. I'm
16 very optimistic.

17 MR. BOGGS: We're willing to do whatever we
18 can at this point to keep it moving forward as best as
19 possible.

20 MR. FORD: I think most of the hurdles we
21 still have to get over are sort of the typical
22 process-type hurdles. We don't really see any of them
23 being as unsurmountable walls. They all seem like they
24 can reasonably be done in the amount of time we have.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: (INAUDIBLE) Purchasing's role

Page 13

1 in this, how you get Purchasing on board and contracts.
2 (INAUDIBLE) so that things happen, paperwork all in
3 line?

4 MR. FORD: We've also found that threats and
5 screaming help. But we're trying to get the bid package
6 ready for both 4 and 5, so that it can be really going
7 through the Procurement Department in July so that the
8 bids can be on the street, and the procurement can be
9 done in August, September (INAUDIBLE) for submittal of
10 paperwork and things like that. They are proceeding
11 parallel now.

12 MR. KERN: Any other thoughts?

13 MS. YAROS: What would the approximate savings
14 be in the cuts that just occurred, the people who were
15 let go?

16 MR. MIDDLETON: Overall, it's about a
17 \$6 million savings annually.

18 MR. KERN: Thank you very much for coming in
19 and visiting with us here tonight. I hope it will be
20 soon that you'll be back here, and we'll be showing
21 pictures of the excavation sites, and we'll be having a
22 toast.

23 We just moved into our ninth year. April was the
24 beginning of the ninth year of RAB. There's been a lot
25 of good things that have happened: Fuel distribution

Page 15

1 distribution list, but we're going to mail it out to --
2 everyone who lives at the Presidio is going to get their
3 own copy of the proposed plan. The comment period is
4 currently scheduled for June 3rd to July 3rd. Public
5 meeting on June 11th. Basically the plan that we talked
6 about last month. We're on track. And then the things
7 that George was talking about. He is working currently
8 on the design, on the bid package, so we can start
9 digging no later than October 1st. Any questions on
10 Landfill 4/Fill Site 5? I know you asked Craig
11 Middleton a couple of questions. Any questions about
12 that process?

13 MS. CHEEVER: Are there any further major
14 hurdles? Are the ARARs all set?

15 MR. COOPER: ARARs are set, the cleanup levels
16 are set. The two biggies, the big hurdles have been
17 handled. Now the rest I think can all be handled back
18 down with Bob and I working out the details, making sure
19 the paperwork's in place and meeting our deadlines for
20 the regulatory process for the public comment period,
21 you know. I think it can be all handled back down at
22 the staff level, and quickly. We're going to be kicking
23 things back up to Craig Middleton and Brian's boss and
24 Bob's boss. I think we're past that level now.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: So was the Board pretty much

Page 14

1 (INAUDIBLE) a lot of that's been taken out. Many, many
2 tanks, a lot of petroleum (INAUDIBLE) Crissy Field was a
3 huge thing. This has been the next big target area.

4 MR. FORD: I suggest we invite Craig back for
5 a toast. We'll have to contrive (INAUDIBLE) 4 and 5
6 closure, whether it's the last shovelful or -- I'm sure
7 we could think of an event to do something to
8 commemorate the end of that.

9 MR. MIDDLETON: I'll bring the champagne, but
10 let's commemorate the beginning of it.

11 MR. KERN: Moving on to 5B. Craig and
12 Presidio-wide program.

13 MR. NELSON: I'm just going to hand out the
14 overhead slides to everyone. Can everybody see that? I
15 apologize for the lack of a screen. I think it's high
16 enough.

17 MS. YAROS: I think it's a good location for
18 it.

19 MR. COOPER: George is not feeling well. I'll
20 be filling in here. There we go. Our first projects.
21 "Yes, we can," I guess is our slogan at this point. We
22 believe we're going to start the public comment period
23 on June 3rd. We got the final go ahead from our Board
24 today. So the proposed plan is ready. That's a fact
25 sheet that we'll be mailing out to not only our RAB

Page 16

1 together in supporting the whole process? Was there a
2 lot of dissension?

3 MR. COOPER: On the cleanup levels? There was
4 some parties, a couple of persons that were really
5 concerned whether this was the right cleanup levels to
6 go with or not. Was this going to end up making these
7 two particular remedies too expensive, basically? Are
8 we going to end up going over budget for our first two
9 landfill sites? That was really their concern. I gave
10 them assurance I don't believe that will happen. DTSC's
11 cleanup level, I think, can be done with very little or
12 no extra cost runs. The proof will be once we dig out
13 the fill material and see what's at the bottom of these
14 landfills. I'm confident that it's not going to be a
15 big problem at the bottom of these landfills with these
16 cleanup levels. They are very stringent. I don't want
17 to put that out there right now. They are extremely
18 stringent for several chemicals. It's basically we're
19 down to laboratory detection limits, or just barely
20 above laboratory detection limits. So we're talking
21 probably some of the -- I didn't do a nationwide search
22 on cleanup levels, but I bet we are going to have some
23 of the cleanest cleanup levels in the country, or at
24 least our ecological sites. Now let's see if we can
25 make them in a cost-effective manner. That's my

Page 17

1 concern, too. I really like having low cleanup levels,
2 but you're got to balance that with cost-effectiveness
3 and making sure we've got enough money to do all of our
4 projects.

5 When Craig Middleton said that the other Board
6 members said, "You know what? Let's get going," they
7 basically won out over the people that were wringing
8 their hands saying, "I don't know. This could be
9 trouble for us." The other Board members said, "Let's
10 just get this remediation going. We have studied and
11 discussed it long enough." And at the end, they had
12 left winning out.

13 MS. WRIGHT: I am so thrilled to hear that.
14 Just to hear that we're going to have the levels that
15 make this project (INAUDIBLE). I know it may or may not
16 be a (INAUDIBLE), but it makes me so proud to be part of
17 this process. And I'm glad to hear you're (INAUDIBLE)
18 raise the budget. We'll keep our fingers crossed.
19 That's fabulous news.

20 MR. KERN: Just so people know, I'm the proud
21 recipient of the Draft Evaluation and Alternatives and
22 Remedial Action Plan for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.

23 MR. COOPER: The pre-distribution review, yes.

24 MR. KERN: I've been reviewing it. This is
25 not a comment. I note that on the sign-up sheet, the

Page 19

1 it now is simply because I'm so concerned. I don't want
2 to slow down the process. I want to be a solution for
3 it.

4 Other than some other things in here, yeah, We'll be
5 fine to go with it as long we can come up to a
6 conclusion that any residual that we leave behind will
7 not impact groundwater adversely.

8 MR. COOPER: We definitely want to jump into
9 action on that one, especially if we can talk about what
10 type of levels we'll be comfortable with for VOCs,
11 especially if we could just kind of go with numbers that
12 you're going to be comfortable with for protection of
13 groundwater.

14 MR. PONTON: Right. Certainly. And as I
15 understand, the threat of VOCs in groundwater means it's
16 really not being protected. But I don't want my
17 executive officer to sign a document that proposes
18 numbers that would not be protective of water quality.
19 That's my job.

20 MR. KERN: Thanks for those candid remarks.

21 MR. BERMAN: Just a clarification, Jim. Can
22 you give us an idea of how far the numbers that are in
23 the Draft RAP actually are from what you think are the
24 safe levels?

25 MR. PONTON: I'm going to leave it for us to

Page 18

1 Regional Water Quality Control Board is also there. So
2 I just wanted to tap into Jim. Are you guys good to go
3 on this too? Are you happy with the document?

4 MR. PONTON: I left Craig an Email today --

5 MR. COOPER: Right. I got it. We can talk
6 about it. I've got some ideas.

7 MR. PONTON: -- about some numbers I see
8 proposed for BFC's. A lot of energy has gone into, as
9 far as I understand, in evaluating cleanup levels for
10 soil that were a type of a ecological receptor and of
11 people. And energy is gone into looking at the
12 groundwater saying that it has a potential beneficial
13 use for drinking water, therefore it's got to be
14 protected to drinking water standards. And that's
15 great. And I guess when I looked at some data today or
16 some numbers in the Cleanup Table regarding BFC's in
17 terms of residuals in soil, what I'm concerned about is
18 any residual that we leave in the soil that could be
19 mobilized through the sand dune basically because it's
20 sandy and basically impacts ground water. And I feel
21 that some of those levels are, when I compare them to
22 the EPA levels for soil screening levels, are pretty
23 high. That caused me a lot of heartburn today this
24 afternoon when I saw that. So I called George, and I
25 talked to him. And the only reason why I'm mentioning

Page 20

1 discuss.

2 MR. BERMAN: Not specifically a number, but is
3 it in order of magnitude?

4 MR. PONTON: Yes, at least. Or several orders
5 of magnitude. I'm not the expert on that comparison
6 either, so I'm open for being taught the right way to
7 look at that, or my teaching people that (INAUDIBLE).

8 MR. BERMAN: So right now the discrepancy is
9 large. You said a couple of orders of magnitude. That
10 seems like factors of a hundred or so.

11 MR. PONTON: It's just a point where we all
12 connect, all the agencies connect. I don't think it's
13 going to be a problem.

14 MR. COOPER: I think we can work something
15 out. What happened on the VOCs is that the Human Health
16 Risk Assessment and the Ecological Risk Assessment
17 really focused on pesticides and the PCBs and drove
18 those down. The VOCs were really -- got picked up for
19 human health exposure just from soil ingestion. So the
20 pathway to groundwater was not directly addressed in our
21 Cleanup Levels Document. And we need to address it.

22 MR. BERMAN: Does that mean that actually the
23 calculation wasn't done, and the real residual VOCs may
24 be actually much lower than stated in the report?

25 MR. COOPER: No. As far as what would be an

1 allowable residual of VOC?
 2 MR. BERMAN: No. You've got an estimate of
 3 the VOCs now.
 4 MR. COOPER: Yes.
 5 MR. BERMAN: And that's based on the --
 6 MR. COOPER: There is no detectable VOCs in
 7 these fill sites, right now. So that chemical data is
 8 not going to change. And so the discussion of cleanup
 9 levels is what is just an acceptable residual amount.
 10 And we don't think we have any VOCs there anyway.
 11 MR. PONTON: Right. It's a what-if. But
 12 right now the document assigns some high numbers to
 13 those what-ifs. I would prefer that if we're going to
 14 assign numbers, we're going to be conservative. I'm
 15 going to assign numbers that we can all live with.
 16 MR. COOPER: Does everyone know what VOCs are?
 17 Volatile organic compounds, your chlorinated solvents,
 18 things like that. Again the characterization data for
 19 these landfills don't show any. But what Jim's
 20 concerned about is that when we do start digging into
 21 this, and we look at the bottom -- because we are going
 22 to sample. We are going to test for it in soils. And
 23 if we do get some residual there, he wants to make sure
 24 that that residual that is left behind is protective of
 25 our groundwater resources; that we don't leave behind a

1 residual that can then migrate down into groundwater.
 2 MR. PONTON: And since VOCs have an affinity
 3 for clays, for organics, and we're looking at beach dune
 4 sand which has few organics, then we basically don't
 5 have any kind of attenuation of that.
 6 MR. BERMAN: Right. It's a direct path.
 7 MR. PONTON: It's a direct path. Right now
 8 there's debris there. I don't know if there's mixed
 9 waste which maybe affects infiltration. Once we restore
 10 dunes, or once there's a restoration that's compatible
 11 with the soil type that's there, we may not have any
 12 kind of umbrella on the site anymore. And that might
 13 accelerate it. Like I said, I don't want this to be a
 14 show-stopper. And I just want to make sure that I have
 15 all my I's dotted and T's crossed.
 16 MS. CHEEVER: Seeing the document, isn't the
 17 point to remove everything?
 18 MR. COOPER: All the waste, yes. So now the
 19 question is once we pick up all the waste and we're down
 20 to native soils, and we're just pulling up some soil
 21 samples, we're done excavating all the waste. We look
 22 at it. It looks like all the (INAUDIBLE) soils are
 23 gone. We're going to kind of over-excavate the area.
 24 Now we're going to sample the bottom of the native
 25 soils. And what the concern would be is as

1 contamination leached out of the waste and contaminated
 2 the top of the native soils that will now be exposed,
 3 the waste is going to be gone. So that's going to be
 4 the new ground surface now. So we want to make sure
 5 that that new ground surface is not contaminated and
 6 that it meets our cleanup levels, not only for
 7 ecological risk and human health risk, but also for
 8 protection of groundwaters.
 9 MS. CHEEVER: Do you have time to respond and
 10 gather your thoughts and write it into the document
 11 before June 3rd?
 12 MR. COOPER: Absolutely, especially if the
 13 Regional Board is open to use these EFA default
 14 screening numbers.
 15 MR. PONTON: Screen levels for (INAUDIBLE) of
 16 groundwater. That's what I'm looking at. We're looking
 17 at the same thing. I brought them with me. They're
 18 right here. I'm thinking the same thing, that they're
 19 significantly different. We're going to be moving some
 20 decimal points.
 21 MR. COOPER: We'd have to decide on the
 22 attenuation factor, and that's the part that I'd like to
 23 discuss with Jim is like what attenuation for
 24 (INAUDIBLE) means. (INAUDIBLE) attenuation means what
 25 is the likelihood of a contaminant to get slowed down in

1 the migration process as it heads downward. It depends
 2 on the soil type. So you kind of have to decide on the
 3 attenuation factor. And then the federal EPA has these
 4 kind of default numbers, and if the Regional Board is
 5 open to that, we can solve this very quickly.
 6 MR. PONTON: Right. As you know, Bob has to
 7 have the resources to do it.
 8 MR. BOGGS: Bob's in agreement with that sort
 9 of approach.
 10 MR. PONTON: Chances are it won't be a
 11 problem. I just want to be sure that we --
 12 MR. NELSON: Jim, we used a risk-based
 13 screening levels in evaluating (INAUDIBLE) health
 14 exposure. Do those also fly for migration to ground
 15 water?
 16 MR. PONTON: No. Like acetone, for example.
 17 Migration of ground water with an attenuation factor of
 18 20. That means it's 20 Ppm for residual for acetone.
 19 This work (INAUDIBLE) 2000. So that's a hundred times
 20 greater.
 21 MR. COOPER: We have risk-based for ingestion,
 22 but not risk-based for --
 23 MR. NELSON: I wasn't sure if they were RBSLs
 24 for migration downwards.
 25 MR. PONTON: There kind of are. They're

1 different screening levels.

2 MR. NELSON: But that's not the same set of --

3 MR. BOGGS: (INAUDIBLE) that groundwater
4 migrating to the only source, Lobos Creek. As soon as
5 you put that in your exposure pathway, the risk drops
6 out. We have the human health number that's very
7 reasonable for a human exposure, but it doesn't take
8 into account if we (INAUDIBLE) put a drinking water in
9 that year. Right, right.

10 And the other thing too is that's not okay to impact
11 groundwater in any way. It's not okay. That's the
12 rule. Even if it won't be exposed until it reaches
13 Lobos Creek at a certain point, it's not okay to
14 contaminate upgradient. So that when it reaches that
15 point, it's not okay. Our job is to protect it so that
16 it's not contaminated. That's the only big concern I
17 have about this document.

18 MS. YOUNG: You've been making the rounds of
19 the public meetings. Is it going pretty good? Are
20 they responding okay?

21 MR. COOPER: Yeah. Brian and George and Doug
22 and myself and Bob and Julie introduced me to everybody.
23 We've spoken to the Planning Association for the
24 Richmond and the Neighborhood Associations for the
25 Presidio just today, and we also spoke to the Presidio

1 Committee for the GGNRA. And I think overall a lot of
2 the questions that people -- except for today. People
3 didn't actually have questions about why I dig up these
4 landfills.

5 PAR and the Presidio Committee were fine with
6 digging up the landfills, but they're basically
7 fast-forwarding to the next step of what's your
8 Restoration Plan, and how is that going to work out?
9 How does the public get involved in that? So a lot of
10 questions were on that.

11 But then today, with the NAP meeting, the
12 Neighborhood Associations meeting, there were several
13 questions about how expensive was capping versus
14 excavation; a lot of questions about beneficial use; why
15 are you going to natural areas instead of a more
16 user-friendly where people can get more involved in the
17 long-term use of that. I didn't hear basically anybody
18 say, "Stop." And that's basically what we were doing.
19 Is this preliminary outreach to these groups to see if
20 there was any type of groundswell out there outside of
21 this RAB that's really opposed to the direction that
22 we're going? I didn't hear any of that. Brian and Bob
23 and Doug can comment.

24 MR. KERN: There was even a comment today that
25 one woman made that she was thinking it was a very

1 prudent thing to do to get rid of the contamination. I
2 concurred.

3 MS. YAROS: But that's an unusual reaction?

4 MR. KERN: No. I think though that it takes
5 an extra step for someone to actually say that. It's
6 kind of like it's obvious, but then most people are
7 critiquing it rather than saying, "Wow. That's a good
8 thing." And she took that step.

9 MR. BOGGS: The tone in the room at that
10 particular time was more, "Why are we doing this? Why
11 are you spending all this money?" It was kind of a
12 negative tone. She, in the midst of that tone, stood up
13 and said, "I think it's a good thing," and it shifted
14 the whole atmosphere of the room.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think if there are other
16 RAB members who represent groups who have meetings in
17 the next few weeks who feel it would be appropriate to
18 be on the agenda, I'm sure Craig would love to go and
19 present --

20 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. If people want extra
21 copies of our proposed plan, tell me. We're about ready
22 to go to print. We're going to print out at least 1500
23 copies to cover the RAB mailing list and everyone who
24 lives in the Presidio. That's 900 residents right
25 there. If you want extra copies to hand out at your

1 community meetings or stuff like that --

2 MR. KERN: You might describe the Proposed
3 Plan. It's not a big packet.

4 MR. COOPER: Exactly. The proposed plan is
5 six pages. It gives a brief overview of that big thick
6 document that's in front. It's basically a summary of
7 the RAP. It talks about briefly the alternatives we
8 considered, how much it cost, what is our preferred
9 alternative and why, and how to submit comments.
10 Inviting people to the public meeting -- that's the
11 purpose of that Proposed Plan.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Speaking as someone who was
13 present at two of these outreach meetings, I want to
14 thank so many of you for coming. It's not just Craig,
15 but also Brian, Bob, George, and Doug. I think that was
16 very helpful in showing all the ways for representing
17 all the different factors coming to a decision like
18 that.

19 MR. COOPER: I think having Brian and Bob
20 there especially reinforced that we're there together.
21 That way, I don't know what was going on in the past,
22 but meanwhile Bob and Brian are there while I'm telling
23 the story. So I think that really gives people the
24 confidence all these different players of government
25 that are intimately involved in this project are

Page 29

1 together on it.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I don't know if we can
3 talk about the past because (INAUDIBLE) our support.

4 MR. COOPER: Yeah. Good point. Maybe we
5 should move on to the first slide.

6 The Contingency Plan. Just as a heads-up on this,
7 it's going to be our next -- we've been just so focused
8 on this Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 RAP. I think as soon we
9 get our head above the water on that, we're going to cut
10 loose on our Contingency Plan, and that's because that's
11 really important to us at the Presidio Trust.

12 And we are considering -- right now we have a draft
13 document that we've distributed with Brian. So far that
14 is a site-wide Contingency Plan, and I think you guys
15 have been told what the Contingency Plan is, and that
16 process is moving forward. But we're considering
17 writing a special Contingency Plan just for the
18 Letterman parcel only. And we haven't made up our minds
19 on that. We wanted to see if there was any reaction
20 from RAB members about that, and if that would raise
21 concerns or questions.

22 MR. KERN: Could you give a little background
23 or the implications of the small site versus the whole
24 Presidio? This is supposed to set the rules if we find
25 something where we don't expect it. And one advantage

Page 30

1 of doing it at just the Letterman site is that is a big
2 construction project. We wanted to be able to keep
3 going once they have people and equipment there, and we
4 may not want to apply those same standards across the
5 whole base. Or people may feel more comfortable making
6 that decision just for that site, and having similar
7 sorts of plans for other locations, other major
8 construction sites. So that's, I think, may be one of
9 the questions for discussion that Craig is pointing out.

10 So before we make a decision, we definitely consult
11 with Jim and Bob and get their concurrence that that is
12 alright with them, and then check back in with Doug and
13 Mark. And certainly by probably the next committee
14 meeting -- we would recommend a decision on whether
15 we're going to --

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're still -- whether it's
17 site-wide or Letterman-specific, we have a window of
18 opportunity of setting up our next public comments
19 period for July; whether it's going to start July 1st,
20 that's not cast in stone like the Landfill 4 route. But
21 we're looking Julyish for that comment period for the
22 Contingency Plan.

23 MR. BERMAN: Procedural question. Do you have
24 to have the Contingency Plan in place before the public
25 meetings?

Page 31

1 MR. COOPER: Yes. Just like with the landfill
2 -- it will follow the same type process as the Landfill
3 4/Fill Site 5 RAP. We have to have the administrative
4 record and a draft Contingency Plan and the
5 administrative record for everyone to review during the
6 30-day comment period.

7 MR. BERMAN: The advantage, of course, of
8 going with Letterman is that so far it's been pretty
9 clean, right? Nothing has really cropped up there that
10 is ominous in some sense.

11 MR. COOPER: Correct. We've had some
12 pesticide hits. We're working with Bob to get that
13 going. So far so good there. It would be an easier
14 document to write because it's on just one piece of
15 property, whereas the site-wide one you've got to
16 consider the entire site (INAUDIBLE). Anyway, we'll
17 give you a bimonthly on the 1st for the direction for
18 the Contingency Plan.

19 Just really briefly, just so we don't forget about
20 all the other CERCLA sites, the more important ones that
21 we're working on right now are Landfill E Field
22 Investigation. I wrote a big joint data quality
23 objectives, stated needs, meetings in process. We went
24 through late last year, early this year, and we all kind
25 of got together on that. And so that Data Quality

Page 32

1 Objectives Table, after incorporating DTSC's and the
2 RAB's final comment on that, was sent over to our
3 consultant EKI, and they're in the process of writing a
4 work plan for that now.

5 And over at the Public Health Hospital, we have a
6 work plan that is with DTSC and the Regional Board for
7 checking out Landfill 8 and Landfill 10 under a 5-year
8 review process under CERCLA. We've talked about that
9 before, but I just wanted to remind everybody that we
10 haven't forgotten about them, and they're still in the
11 works.

12 The next important CERCLA decision document would be
13 another RAP, so after the Contingency Plan Decision
14 document, the next decision document after that will be
15 the Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3, 4 and Fill Site 6
16 RAP. We got some comments back from Brian on that, on
17 the draft, and our consultants on this particular
18 document is Treadwell, and they're incorporating
19 comments that Brian and the Trust had. And so they're
20 in the process of generating the next RAP for that for
21 us to take a look at. But concurrent with that, we're
22 also working on the design. And I think I talked to you
23 guys before. There's a bit of a risk on that, but it's
24 a way to try to keep things going. We have, I think,
25 with these sites. The Trust and the Park Service are

1 heading toward excavation remedies for those sites also.
 2 So we're at least starting the process with another
 3 consultant, Harding ESE, to begin the design work for
 4 what we think will ultimately be the selected remedy in
 5 the RAPS. So that way, things are kind of done in
 6 parallel basically at the risk of the Trust, but it's a
 7 way so we can start the cleanup work a lot faster. As
 8 soon as the RAP is signed, we'll have a design that's
 9 far along or almost done, and we can kick into the
 10 remedy a lot quicker then.

11 MS. CHEEVER: How does the (INAUDIBLE)
 12 Feasibility Study the same way that 4 and 5 do? How
 13 does the Feasibility Study (INAUDIBLE) taking something
 14 out even when the Feasibility Study is over?

15 MR. COOPER: Ask your question again?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: I understand the question. 4
 17 and 5 were taken out of the Feasibility Study. When you
 18 see the Feasibility Study, you won't see a full
 19 Evaluation Alternative in the Feasibility Study. And in
 20 the document that you'll have, it's called a RAP and an
 21 Evaluation Alternative. So it was put in here before
 22 the next one, Baker Beach 3, 4 and Fill Site 6. That
 23 will, at this point, is going to rely on the Feasibility
 24 Study Evaluation. It will be like a conventional
 25 process. The Feasibility Study -- when Janelle

1 Hernandez (PHONETIC) presents a preferred alternative,
 2 people will have an opportunity to interact with that,
 3 and then a RAP will be prepared which says, based on the
 4 Feasibility Study, based on anything else that comes
 5 into the picture, this will be its function. So it's a
 6 little bit different than 4 and 5.

7 MR. BOGGS: And that does hinge on making sure
 8 the Feasibility Study is available before the RAP is
 9 done. And if that doesn't happen, then the pieces of
 10 the Feasibility Study that are important for the report
 11 would have to get put into the RAP, and then it would
 12 just be like 4 and 5.

13 MR. PONTON: Than what's left in the FS?

14 MR. NELSON: Fewer Sites. Thirty-seven more
 15 sites. Fewer landfills, for sure. Four fewer, I guess.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: The purpose is to be able to
 17 create some construction sooner, taking some of the
 18 sites that are less controversial out. Otherwise for
 19 (INAUDIBLE) can be done early so that construction can
 20 start this year and not have to wait for the entire
 21 block of sites to come through. So they can meter out
 22 some of the construction and mitigate the idea of having
 23 to do all the construction all at once which has a lot
 24 of negatives associated with it.

25 MR. COOPER: Okay. Real briefly. In LAIR,

1 the petroleum and pesticide detects that we've
 2 encountered in the demolition work there have been
 3 removed now, and we're now in the process -- Harding ESE
 4 is our consultant for that project, and they're now
 5 writing the closure report on that.

6 Bob, are there any more sampling required
 7 (INAUDIBLE) I don't know.

8 MR. BOGGS: (INAUDIBLE) I believe so.

9 MR. NELSON: You forgot the Petroleum Program.

10 MR. COOPER: Okay. I'm not an expert on the
 11 Petroleum Program, but we just want you to know that we
 12 have a staff of people, and that it's not all about the
 13 CERCLA sites. We are making major progress in our
 14 Petroleum Program, and I think that's why we wanted to
 15 put these slides in our handout for tonight.

16 Just from the bullets that are identified here, we
 17 did several tank removals recently. We've got several
 18 more tank removals along the Coastal Battery Plan. And
 19 at the same time we're also filing our Notices of
 20 Closure with the city and requesting their final
 21 approval that those tank closures be done properly. So,
 22 next slide.

23 MR. BERMAN: It would be nice to see a kind of
 24 post-hoc document which sort of summarizes the various
 25 petroleum cleanup activities. There's a series of

1 things that would go on, but there is not kind of a book
 2 or an overall -- not an FS but a post-hoc document which
 3 summarizes where the petroleum sites were, what's been
 4 done. And it's sort of a package because it's kind of a
 5 parallel activity, in some sense, without really the
 6 same emphasis on documentation as on some of the others.
 7 Does it make any sense?

8 MR. COOPER: It does. I don't know if we have
 9 anything in the works. Brian, do we have --

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: You brought that up a number
 11 of months ago. George actually started working on it,
 12 and I know that he has gotten distracted. I'm sure if
 13 he were here he'd tell you that that's a very good idea
 14 and that he's working on it. I'm sure Craig will go
 15 back and remind him that it's still a good idea and that
 16 he should continue working on it. I'm pretty sure that
 17 George has an idea of what you're asking for. I know
 18 that he had worked on assembling the information into
 19 tables and things like that. I think we've discovered a
 20 fairly good program.

21 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: And it wasn't a simple task
 23 to bring it all into an easier read.

24 MR. BERMAN: It represents a large amount of
 25 activity and successful activity and expense that has

Page 37

1 been paid out to do it.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I know George is very
3 supportive of the concept. He's just gotten distracted
4 with other things. (INAUDIBLE) It's on his to-do list.

5 MR. COOPER: I think that's important, not
6 only, I think, especially with my new position is
7 probably we can talk about accomplishments for the RAB
8 but for the Board of Directors, I think just
9 accomplishments-type reporting is going to have many
10 audiences down the road. So I think that's an important
11 thing to work on.

12 On Corrective Action sites, they're basically really
13 the mega-petroleum problems with some potential for
14 hazardous substance, CERCLA-type contaminants mixed in
15 or CERCLA-type source areas. There's four on this list.
16 They're all in the works. Building 1065, we've got
17 regulatory comments on that. So we're revising that
18 plan. The Commissary PX --

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: If I could fill in for
20 George, that one actually is targeted to get into the
21 field soon. The plan went out late last fall. We
22 recently had a meeting with the regulators, and I hope
23 they would agree that their comments were addressed or
24 answered, and that they will soon get a written
25 confirmation of that. The Trust will be able to move

Page 38

1 forward and implement those things in the field and
2 actually collect more data, the whole objective of the
3 study, and then use that additional data to create the
4 Corrective Action Plan which is analogous to the RAP in
5 evaluating or selecting the appropriate remedy for the
6 site.

7 MR. COOPER: So we're still at the
8 characterization stage for all four of these.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right now.

10 MR. COOPER: Commissary, Building 1349 is over
11 near Fill Site 5, and Building 207 and 231 is --

12 MR. NELSON: Near Doyle Drive. Halleck and
13 Doyle Drive. The latter two here are internally being
14 reviewed, and the former two I believe have gone to
15 regulators.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: And actually the last one
17 hasn't even been formulated, so it's --

18 MR. KERN: That last one is a pretty
19 far-reaching project. It has a lot of interaction with
20 other projects. Doyle Drive and the Tennessee Hollow
21 things, so it may be worth bringing other folks in at an
22 early stage to give you input on that.

23 MR. COOPER: All right. I'm assuming we sent
24 a draft -- just as in the CERCLA program. Are we
25 sending draft documents to the (INAUDIBLE)? Oh, sure.

Page 39

1 We haven't seen anything on it. It's still on the
2 horizon according to George earlier today. And Jim had
3 some comments that related to that. George wants to
4 make sure he's got a good handle on it, the beginnings
5 of a schedule for getting involved. We've talked about,
6 and that is coming in the next weeks or months. A
7 discussion has developed in the Field Investigation
8 Plan, and now Building 1065, which will trigger
9 additional field work, and then lead into a Corrective
10 Action Plan.

11 Next slide. A little bit of humor. Bob got a
12 letter that myself and Brian was copied on from
13 Caltrans. To back up a little bit. We had a meeting
14 with Caltrans and the Park Service that Bob hosted, and
15 all the parties that Bob invited showed up. And DTSC
16 laid out the general groundwork. And then thereafter
17 the PRP side. I was basically trying to set up a
18 meeting amongst PRPs and sent E-mails to Caltrans and
19 other parties to come to a technical meeting so we
20 could -- What DTSC said is, "You guys need to get your
21 act together and make a proposal back to the state
22 regulators." I was trying to pull together the PRPs so
23 we could make this final proposal. You know, are we
24 together? What's our proposal? What about our daily
25 gaps? That type of discussion. And then we would sit

Page 40

1 down and the PRPs would meet privately and then present
2 it to Bob. So I was trying to put this PRP meeting
3 together and the Caltrans person said, "Oh, can you like
4 wait a week because we're going to write a letter."

5 I said, "Okay. I'll wait a week."

6 And then we got this letter, and I'll let Bob take
7 it from here. Caltrans is just very uncomfortable
8 meeting with PRPs for Mountain Lake. I think it's a
9 public letter. I think they closed their letter by
10 saying, "We are going to vigorously defend ourselves in
11 our liability." I don't remember the exact quote.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was like, "Go away."

13 MS. CHEEVER: You mean they're not taking any
14 responsibility for any of it?

15 MR. BOGGS: No. It was a complete blow-off
16 letter. It's kind of like, "Get lost. You don't have
17 any legal basis here. We aren't going to participate,
18 and if you try to make us anticipate, we're going to
19 fight it legally as hard as we can. It's waiting for a
20 legal response.

21 MR. COOPER: Okay.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: This is another pretty much
23 standard procedure, right?

24 MR. BOGGS: It's not uncommon procedure.
25 There's other cases where their liability has been a

1 little bit more clearly mapped out and they're more
2 willing, but there's some things to be discussed and
3 worked out here that --

4 MS. CHEEVER: Do you have a time estimate of
5 how long it will take to resolve all of this? Are you
6 talking, months, years?

7 MR. BOGGS: Years. The truth is it's not
8 going to be finally negotiated or settled until they get
9 out in the field and work out some quantities
10 (INAUDIBLE) we'll probably have a basis for an
11 agreement. It's not uncommon that they establish a
12 basis for agreement and depending on how much they dig
13 up (INAUDIBLE) it's so much goes this way and so much
14 goes that way. That wouldn't be uncommon in a case like
15 this. Sometimes they do. One of the PRPs will write a
16 check for X million dollars and say, "This absolves us
17 of all responsibility if you cash this check." And the
18 Trust cashes the check, so then it's all the Trust
19 problem. There is a couple of ways that they're
20 handled, but it's generally not a short process.

21 MR. COOPER: But both Caltrans and the Army
22 seem -- they're not near that stage yet of writing a
23 check. But Mountain Lake is in the Feasibility Study,
24 so before we can do a cleanup, you've got to do the
25 Feasibility Study, you've got to write a RAP, so the

1 Trust is committed to keep that process going. We've
2 got to keep pushing the legal side so it doesn't come
3 back a delay case.

4 Real quickly on Crissy Field closure. This is
5 pretty exciting. This is pretty much the last little
6 bits of cleanup that needs to happen in Crissy Field,
7 and then we'll be able to close out that entire operable
8 unit. It's the Skeet Range Cleanup, and it's scheduled
9 to start on May 21st. So if you're down in Crissy Field
10 in late May or early June, you'll see the signs up kind
11 of cordoning off certain areas of the beach.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the signs will come
13 up tomorrow approximately. The signs will be new
14 communications signs. A whole series of signs will
15 start going up as early as tomorrow.

16 MS. WRIGHT: Craig, is there really anything
17 to see? Shall we try to schedule a little visit, or is
18 it going to be hard to see?

19 MR. COOPER: Brian, how close will people be
20 able to see?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think we'll get it
22 (INAUDIBLE) fairly close. If you observe, you'll be
23 able to stand on the Promenade. The Promenade will not
24 be interrupted. You can do that on your own. How much
25 you'll be able to see over the view of the (INAUDIBLE)

1 you may not be able to see in, but you certainly can be
2 close enough to see the work.

3 MS. WRIGHT: And is that all at low tide?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: They're already at four areas
5 of excavation. The two farthest out will be done during
6 the low tide so that it will likely be very early in the
7 morning, very early in the morning. The other
8 excavations that are higher on the beach will go over
9 several tidal cycles. There are some of those that are
10 actually confirmation samples. We patrol them for a few
11 days. It will be fairly exciting to see the trucks.
12 The trucks are going to be driving on the beach. So it
13 will be big construction out there.

14 MR. COOPER: We have Fill Site 7 and 900
15 closure area. Brian, I'm not familiar with this
16 project.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: Jan (INAUDIBLE) was actually
18 working on 9 west (INAUDIBLE) area today. There was
19 drilling crews out there installing one new well and
20 reinstalling a well that was put in a little bit high so
21 it didn't actually detect the ground water. It missed
22 the groundwater. We actually drilled a new well
23 (INAUDIBLE), and then there's a little bit of additional
24 sampling that needs to be done, tidying up some of the
25 loose ends that the Army didn't complete. So that's a

1 very short period. I don't know. Other folks here
2 might know the timeframe, but I would guess it's just a
3 couple days' worth of work.

4 MR. COOPER: The last slide is our Groundwater
5 Monitoring Program. I think at the last RAB meeting we
6 distributed our Third Quarter Report for 2001. I have
7 Mark's copy here. Jennifer Coats from the Trust is
8 here. She's the one that gave the groundwater overview
9 last month. Anything to say about the groundwater
10 monitoring program?

11 MS. COATS: Tonight I handed out Table 1 which
12 is our proposed plan of the analytes we want to sample
13 in the different wells. I handed it out for you to
14 review. We plan on starting sampling actually
15 (INAUDIBLE) on May 28th. If anybody wants to come out
16 and watch what we do and how it's done, they're more
17 than welcome to. Give me a call and I can coordinate
18 it.

19 MR. COOPER: If anyone's interested, call me.
20 I don't have Jen's number. Call me and I'll forward the
21 message to her. That's that. Thanks for your
22 attention.

23 MR. KERN: Thanks. The next item not on your
24 agenda, 5B, is a letter that I'd like to pass out now
25 from the RAB to Craig Middleton with regard to a need

Page 45

1 for urgent action at Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. This
2 has been passed around via E-mail over the last few
3 days, and hopefully it will be in time to have some
4 effect on the whole process. You really should take a
5 moment and read it through if you'd like.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: How long is this actually going
7 to take?

8 MR. KERN: He said a month or two. Any
9 comments?

10 MS. CHEEVER: I'm wondering if the meeting
11 with the Trust Board changes the situation for this
12 letter very much. For example, this letter refers to
13 conservative or low cleanup levels for pesticides. Are
14 those still in place after today's Trust Board meeting?

15 MR. COOPER: Yes.

16 MR. BERMAN: That seems to be the hot point.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Yes. Will they remain in place?

18 MR. COOPER: For these two sites? Yeah,
19 unless someone from the public convinces Bob to move
20 them through the public comment process.

21 MR. BOGGS: It's not convincing me. It's
22 convincing my management at this point. They're in line
23 for these cleanup levels for these sites. It's not my
24 decision. It's out of my hands.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: So if there was a groundswell

Page 47

1 MR. PONTON: The soil standards.

2 MR. BOGGS: The soil standards (INAUDIBLE).
3 And it also has to do with a set of chemicals that we
4 really haven't detected at these landfills. So we share
5 Jim's concern. We don't anticipate this, but there is
6 definitely an easy potential to landfill (INAUDIBLE).
7 So Jim's concern is very good that we make sure that if
8 we leave, if we come in contact with these contaminants,
9 we make sure that we leave them at levels that protect
10 the groundwater. He talked with my agency about that,
11 and we agreed wholeheartedly. So we don't anticipate it
12 being a concern or problem with these landfills, but I
13 think everybody shares the concern that if by chance we
14 run into these, we want to make sure we have safe
15 levels. But I think we can get their solution
16 (INAUDIBLE) by adopting like what was suggested, some
17 EPA screening levels such as that they're screened at a
18 very low level that's very protective. If we run into
19 that problem, we'll jump into action and deal with it as
20 best we can. I think it's more a matter of just making
21 some stopgap measures in case we run into this potential
22 problem.

23 MR. BERMAN: I think you explained the
24 procedure before. My question was really, is there any
25 value to remark on this in this letter?

Page 46

1 of public opinion for that solution --

2 MR. BOGGS: Depending on who was leading the
3 public outcry, there are certain individuals that are
4 around the Presidio that have amazing powers of
5 persuasion. Aside from those people exerting their
6 political clout, scientifically there's a cleanup level
7 that the department would like to see.

8 MR. KERN: So this letter would still be
9 relevant to the Presidio?

10 MR. COOPER: Oh, I think so. It ain't over
11 'till it's over. So I would have no problem with you
12 guys moving forward with this letter.

13 MS. WRIGHT: Should we put that section in
14 bold?

15 MR. BERMAN: The one concern that -- maybe
16 this is out of place -- this discussion on the VOCs that
17 we had earlier is not addressed in this letter at all.
18 It's congratulatory on the low cleanup levels for
19 pesticide. On the other hand, Jim has pointed out that
20 it's not so low when it comes to drinking water
21 standards. So the question is it --

22 MR. BOGGS: Actually one thing on that, we are
23 low in respect to drinking water standards for water.

24 The water there must meet drinking water standards.

25 MR. BERMAN: No, I meant --

Page 48

1 MR. NELSON: The Trust Board hasn't heard
2 anything about it yet, so it would be a surprise to see
3 it in a letter.

4 MR. BERMAN: Oh, this is addressed to Craig,
5 not them.

6 MR. NELSON: Right. It would be a surprise to
7 him as well. It just came up this afternoon.

8 MR. BERMAN: Since we're discussing this, and
9 this was a small but interesting point, whether it's in
10 a Contingency Plan or exactly how it's going to be dealt
11 with hasn't been decided. The question is, since we
12 have the letter on the table, is there any benefit to
13 mentioning this or not? And maybe because it's the only
14 substantive thing that really didn't get addressed at
15 all in the letter.

16 MR. BOGGS: I think if the issue ever gets
17 raised out of the room of Brian and Craig and Jim and I,
18 i.e. if it does have to get raised to the management
19 level and we can't work out a decision, it would
20 probably be appropriate. But at this point, the issue
21 hasn't been raised to management, and it would probably
22 raise a flag for them that may not need to be raised
23 yet.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think Jim caught an
25 omission in the process that is valid. One of the

1 reasons it was omitted is that it's not likely to occur,
2 but it's still a very valid addition that needs to be
3 corrected. And I don't think (INAUDIBLE) to correct it
4 adequately. I think it's going to be pretty
5 straightforward to fix the document such as the
6 regulators are happy with. I would guess probably as
7 early as next week it would be fixed.

8 MR. BERMAN: So the answer to my question is
9 that this is something that's resolved at the technical
10 level, and this being a management directive letter, it
11 would serve no purpose to bring it forward at this time.

12 MR. BOGGS: So it would be completed at
13 Tuesday at 1:00 o'clock. We're scheduled to sit down
14 and work it through.

15 MR. KERN: I would say, "Let's get this letter
16 out the door." Are there any other comments on it? I
17 do want to thank everyone for commenting so rapidly and
18 getting all those things in. It made it a very good
19 letter. Thank you. So then I think it would be
20 appropriate to hear a motion on moving this letter.

21 MR. COOPER: Move to adopt the letter, all of
22 it.

23 MR. KERN: Second.

24 MR. BERMAN: Before we conclude, the
25 signatures are going to be everybody that's here, or

1 MR. BOGGS: Not much to update. We've been
2 rapidly working trying to get past the final hurdles on
3 4 and 5 Cleanup Levels and handling all those issues. I
4 think everything else is pretty well handled.

5 MR. KERN: Anything from you, Jim?

6 MR. PONTON: No, other than what's been
7 reported that we met and we commented on 1065. We met
8 on that last week to discuss the comments. I commented
9 on a letter for a proposed pump test at Building 230 and
10 then in the vicinity of Tennessee Hollow, proposed
11 alignment for tunnel alignment. We're going to meet
12 with -- I wrote a letter -- I had some concern regarding
13 the pump test that it was going to be a C Zone.
14 (INAUDIBLE) There's the A Zone, B Zone, C Zone and
15 (INAUDIBLE). The test was going to be a C Zone test,
16 pumping water from C Zone to see if there's leakage
17 between the zones. And I was concerned about the
18 pollution that is in the A Zone that we don't draw it
19 into the C Zone and create a bigger problem. So we're
20 going to meet with them in fact next Tuesday before
21 (INAUDIBLE) which is before the (INAUDIBLE) mentioned
22 for this, so is an all day long endeavor.

23 I'm working out the Commissary Investigation Work
24 Plan. This Work Plan, this week I plan to finish it,
25 which is the RAP, Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4 RAP. And

1 just your signature? Or how do you want to handle the
2 signatures?

3 MR. KERN: I would think Mark for us. That
4 would satisfy.

5 MS. CHEEVER: I agree with that. I'm just
6 remembering that the other letter we sent two months ago
7 said at the bottom -- I forget exactly what it was --
8 maybe, "A resolution to send this letter was passed by
9 seven to six or unanimous vote of the RAB members
10 present at our Board meeting at such and such a date."

11 I think that's nice to say that. I guess can I
12 amend the motion to include a sentence to that effect,
13 to be crafted more carefully than just stated.

14 MR. BERMAN: And then it would be signed by
15 Mark.

16 MS. CHEEVER: And then it would be signed by
17 Mark.

18 MR. KERN: Okay. So, all right. So we have
19 an amended motion, and we have a second for that?

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Second.

21 MR. KERN: Is there any discussion? It's been
22 moved and seconded to send this letter with the amended
23 sentence. All in favor? Opposed? (Motion passed
24 unanimously.)

25 Onwards. Item six.

1 we're really busy. But other than, I really am thankful
2 that we talked about the DOCs and the soil numbers and
3 stuff. As I said before, I take this pretty seriously,
4 and that was my main concern when I read that. So I'm
5 glad that Sam talked about it and brought it up and you
6 all brought it up. So thanks. That's about it.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would like to add, in case
8 there are questions about what Jim was talking about,
9 pumping (INAUDIBLE) since it's not a remediation issue
10 (INAUDIBLE) as part of the support work that's being
11 requested by the Park Service and the Trust of the Doyle
12 Drive Project and allowing data to help support and
13 evaluate alternative alignments that will go into the
14 evaluation. And one of the concerns that's been raised
15 is, under the tunneling alternatives, puts Doyle Drive
16 into a tunnel that could detrimentally harm or disrupt
17 the subsurface flow of Tennessee Hollow as it leaves the
18 terrestrial environment and goes out toward the Bay. It
19 has to do with the particulars of how they would build
20 the tunnel and how it would be placed with respect to
21 aquifers or the division between aquifers. And that by
22 putting the tunnel in it, it would permanently disrupt a
23 current situation with would change how the water moves
24 through the system and could affect one way or the
25 other, flow through that regime. And knowing the

1 integrity of that aquifer will help in the evaluation of
 2 the tunnel alternative and the possible harm to the
 3 public. So based on requests by the Park Service and
 4 the Trust, the Caltrans builder on Friday has agreed to
 5 undertake some testing to help provide the data. And
 6 because the opportune place to do the testing was near
 7 or within the Study area of 231 and 207, the Trust
 8 submitted a plan to the Regional Board because there is
 9 a potential for the test to do damage. The Park Service
 10 believes that the test -- that the risk of damage is
 11 small compared to the data learned, but it is important
 12 to the Regional Board to be in agreement with their
 13 approach. And so we'll be working with Jim next Tuesday
 14 morning to try answer his concerns and help work through
 15 the basis of what was proposed and why.

16 MR. KERN: I just want to say thanks to you
 17 Jim for paying close attention to that and bringing up
 18 that issue about the VOVs.

19 Item seven. New business. Schedule and financial
 20 reporting. Let's see. We did have a conversation about
 21 the financial reporting in this past week. Mark and I
 22 received an Excel Spread Sheet of potential cost
 23 accounting format for our comments. And so rather than
 24 talk about that too much tonight or pass it out, we
 25 thought it would be more easily done at the next

1 theoretically at our late-night June 11th RAB meeting,
 2 it can be discussed at that time.

3 MR. KERN: Or it might be a better thing to do
 4 at our committee meeting. We can talk about it at our
 5 next committee meeting.

6 MR. BOGGS: We can talk about it at the
 7 committee meeting after the quarterly meeting.

8 MR. BERMAN: On the June 25th meeting.

9 MR. KERN: A couple of recently released
 10 documents --

11 MR. NELSON: Sorry to interrupt. We have to
 12 apologize. There is an error in the agenda that
 13 includes these last two bullets under Recently Released
 14 Documents. This was a carryover from I think the last
 15 meeting or possibly even the meeting before that. I'm
 16 not sure. I honestly don't believe any documents have
 17 been released. I haven't released anything. Brian,
 18 have you signed off on anything being released?

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not to date.

20 MR. NELSON: I don't think anything's gone
 21 out.

22 MR. COOPER: Jennifer handed this out at the
 23 last RAB meeting. This is the Third Quarter of 2001
 24 Groundwater Quarterly Report. This is the only thing.
 25 It wasn't in the last one. It should have been a bullet

1 committee meeting next week. And if there is anybody
 2 who would like to see the Excel Spread Sheet, we can
 3 certainly send that along to you if you want to see it.
 4 We just didn't want to blast people with a weird format.
 5 Is there anyone who would like to see it?

6 MR. BERMAN: You just E-mail it to us?

7 MR. KERN: So I got Jan and Tracy and Dennis.

8 MR. BERMAN: How big a file is it?

9 MR. KERN: Very small. It's just about a
 10 page. It's blank.

11 MR. COOPER: The financial information is not
 12 in there yet. First we need to agree on the cost
 13 categories. I want to get your input on these headers
 14 first before we start putting in all the information
 15 writing the reports.

16 MR. KERN: The schedule. What would be a
 17 reasonable schedule? What should we be thinking about
 18 in terms of talking about the latest schedule?

19 MR. COOPER: The Trust is committed to send
 20 the State a revised schedule ten days before our next
 21 quarterly meeting, ten days before June 7th.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. The quarterly meeting is
 23 the 18th.

24 MR. COOPER: Oh. Okay. On June 7th. A new
 25 schedule will be issued no later than June 7th. So

1 for this agenda. But there hasn't been any other
 2 documents released.

3 We're still committed to do that, the E-mail
 4 announcement to everybody. We just forgot to.

5 MR. KERN: All right. Action items. We have
 6 the Petroleum Cleanup Program Summary. Let me try to
 7 see where George is on that. We have an E-mail of the
 8 updated cost sheet to approximate. We have discussing
 9 the financial reporting at the next committee meeting as
 10 an agenda item. At the following committee meeting,
 11 June 25th, we have a schedule on the agenda. We are
 12 going to update the letter, and send it out.

13 Any other action items?

14 MS. YOUNG: New public relations person will
 15 be coming to this committee meeting?

16 MR. NELSON: I called Craig in that department
 17 to get somebody there.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Before, this public relations
 19 person didn't always come to the committee meetings.

20 MR. NELSON: You mean the Jane Packer person?

21 MS. CHEEVER: Yes.

22 MR. COOPER: I'm assuming -- Tia Lombardi is
 23 the head of Public Affairs. I'm definitely going to
 24 meet with her. We made a commitment to bring somebody,
 25 but it would be definitely for purposes of introducing

Page 57

1 this person, not that they would be expected to come to
2 every committee meeting.

3 MR. NELSON: It may very well be a rotating
4 position. They're several people in the department.
5 They may rotate just to get everybody some exposure to
6 the program so that they're all well versed. Jodie
7 Sandford one time, Jackie Michaels another time. Who
8 else works over there?

9 MR. COOPER: I don't know. I haven't talked
10 to Tia about this at all. Do you have a preference for
11 having just one committed person?

12 MS. CHEEVER: Not necessarily. I really don't
13 know. I don't know that well who is on that staff.
14 There is this concern that we expressed last time. So
15 you have a lot of people come in, and then it gets
16 charged to your budget, and are you coming out above or
17 below where you were before?

18 MR. COOPER: Exactly. That's what I wanted to
19 talk to you about.

20 MS. CHEEVER: On the other hand, I know maybe
21 one of them might be working more on the newsletter, and
22 others are on other things, so (INAUDIBLE) to us. So
23 maybe not that much is lost. But in general, we should
24 make sure we're not worse off.

25 MR. COOPER: Exactly. Definitely. I don't

Page 59

1 MR. COOPER: Okay.

2 MS. WRIGHT: If they decide to split up some
3 of the responsibilities among staff, as long as it's
4 consistent with that person assuming that
5 responsibility. I still prefer that it's one person,
6 but if they need to, you can split that up between two
7 or three, that they at least keep the same duties that
8 one person (INAUDIBLE).

9 MS. YAROS: I second that. I think the
10 consistency is really important.

11 MR. NELSON: Probably Denise will still be the
12 main point of contact until further notice. I've been
13 trying to work out what's going to be the procedure.

14 MS. WRIGHT: Do you think Denise could come?

15 MR. NELSON: She's currently performing at an
16 opera right now, so as long as it's not a long
17 announcement.

18 Actually along those same lines -- I apologize for
19 not making this announcement earlier -- I received an
20 E-mail from our database and web person in our
21 department recently indicating that on the Trust
22 website, www.presidiotrust.gov, there's a section on
23 environmental cleanup now that is updated and includes
24 quite an extensive section on the RAB -- scathing
25 information -- I'm not sure you want to read it. It's

Page 58

1 want the community involvement person -- we need one,
2 but one of my concerns is that they not get somebody
3 that I constantly have to brief and tell what's going
4 on. That's not what I want to do.

5 MR. NELSON: We were able to work in having
6 one staff person from our department go to their weekly
7 meetings and brief them. So they're all in their
8 meeting updated if one person has to come to a meeting.
9 Jane was doing that. She was going to their public
10 affairs meetings, staff meetings. She was in touch with
11 what was going on outside remediation and vice versa.

12 MR. BOGGS: It might be easier to get a
13 regular person that can be a little bit more in tune
14 with the RAB and what the community meetings are for
15 this RAB. A person coming and going may not always
16 remember the little action items or the little concerns
17 and nuances that happen.

18 MR. BERMAN: I think that's a very good point.
19 I think that you'll find that it's much better if you
20 would appoint one person and give them that job and let
21 them develop into it than having it as a rotating
22 position. I think that's a way of dissipating the
23 activity and allowing the people not to take full
24 responsibility of their obligation. I personally vote
25 strongly against the idea of a rotating coordinator.

Page 60

1 actually very good and it goes through outlines of some
2 of the upcoming projects. It shows some maps of sites
3 where there's clean up coming, some background and site
4 histories and preliminary plans, etc. So you should
5 check it out. There's photographs and all sorts of
6 information.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Is it obvious how to click onto
8 it?

9 MR. NELSON: Yeah. On the Trust website,
10 there's some photographs and there's a banner. And then
11 on the left-hand side, there is a column of things in a
12 row. One is environmental clean up. Just click on it,
13 And it will take you there.

14 MR. COOPER: We've gone live. We've been
15 talking about this for a long time.

16 MR. NELSON: There may be some kinks to work
17 out, and it's obviously being updated as things change.
18 It's a good start.

19 MR. BERMAN: Was there an in-house person that
20 did that?

21 MR. NELSON: Well, we had a person in-house
22 who did the engineering side, yeah.

23 MR. BERMAN: No. I meant who actually did the
24 section on environmental remediation.

25 MR. NELSON: It was a group effort. Brian,

Page 61

1 myself and Jane actually did a lot of work on it.
 2 (INAUDIBLE) Miller was the data base person who made it
 3 all work out, and we had help from Building 34, that's a
 4 GIF person, who helped us out as well.

5 MR. BERMAN: It wasn't a person in the
 6 Communications Department that was writing to you guys
 7 who were doing the writing?

8 MR. NELSON: They were reviewing everything,
 9 Public Affairs, but we did the writing.

10 MR. COOPER: We did the writing.

11 MR. BERMAN: I'm only asking that because if
 12 there was a public affairs person that sort of already
 13 was up to speed by participating in this, that person
 14 could be identified and could be the liaison here to
 15 fill Jane's position to a certain extent.

16 MR. NELSON: That's really up to Tia.

17 MS. CHEEVER: One more thing about Landfill 4
 18 and Fill Site 5. I gather that this document which
 19 we've given to Doug and Mark is not quite the final
 20 document that will be released?

21 MR. COOPER: Correct.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Even if we know one thing
 23 already --

24 MR. COOPER: Correct.

25 MS. CHEEVER: -- maybe you'll have more ideas.

Page 62

1 When are you going to release the final document? On
 2 June 3rd or earlier?

3 MR. COOPER: No later than June 3rd. The
 4 administrative record has to be complete. So, no later
 5 than June 3rd.

6 MS. CHEEVER: Not to waste paper, but there
 7 are many of us who would really like to have the
 8 document as well as the six-page summary. Is that
 9 possible to request it or something?

10 MR. COOPER: Uh-huh. If you want a copy when
 11 we mail out the six-page summary, there's a little
 12 section on how to obtain more information, and it says
 13 "Call Bob," or I. So we're basically having people make
 14 a phone call and say, "I'd like to get a copy of the
 15 RAP," and then they can either drive down to the
 16 Presidio Trust Library -- but generally, what happens is
 17 that only a few people make that request, so I'm going
 18 to have some extra copies in by my back pocket to loan
 19 out to people, basically. But if I get overwhelmed with
 20 requests, then I am going to have to ask people --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: If they are RAB members, you
 22 know they want one. You know you want one, right?

23 MS. CHEEVER: I know I want one.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: And you can make sure that
 25 Craig gets an E-mail reminding him to make an extra copy

Page 63

1 for you. That way you can order the first run to have
 2 enough copies for those RAB members who know they want
 3 one right now.

4 MR. COOPER: You've got to promise me you're
 5 going to read it. So send me the E-mail if you are
 6 interested in reviewing the details, because you will
 7 get the six-page summary for sure.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: You won't need that request
 9 until about the 28th. Maybe the end of next week would
 10 be a reasonable cutoff to get the note to Craig so that
 11 he can hand it out before it goes into publishing.

12 MR. KERN: And if any of you want to see what
 13 you might want to request, we have these, and you can
 14 check it out physically there.

15 Any there any other comments? Any other
 16 announcements? Any other items for the good of the
 17 order?

18 Very good. Thank you so much for your participation
 19 tonight. We look forward to seeing you at the committee
 20 meeting. Meeting adjourned.

21 (The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.)

22 ---oOo---

23 RAB MEMBERS

24 Sam Berman

25 Bob Boggs, DTSC

Page 64

1 Edward Callahan

2 Craig Cooper

3 Dennis Downing

4 George Ford, Presidio Trust

5 Doug Kern

6 Jan Monaghan

7 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

8 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board

9 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

10 Tracy Wright

11 Gloria Yaros

12 Mark Youngkin

13

14 Others Present:

15 Craig Middleton, Presidio Trust

16 Jennifer Coats, Presidio Trust

17 ---oOo---

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PUBLIC MEETING ON LANDFILL 4 AND FILL SITE 5
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

JUNE 11, 2002
6:00-7:30 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: My name is Craig Cooper and I
2 work for the Presidio Trust, and I'm in charge of the
3 Environmental Department. I'd like to thank everyone
4 for coming here tonight for tonight's public meeting.

5 So the purpose of why we're getting together
6 tonight is to talk about two landfills here at the
7 Presidio and what the Trust is recommending on how to
8 clean up those landfills. And those two landfills are
9 called Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. I'm going to be using
10 those two names over and over again. I'm going to give
11 you an idea of the background to these landfills; how
12 did they get created; what contaminants do they contain,
13 and what's our cleanup strategy for these landfills. So
14 I'll give you an overview of that. I'll give you an
15 overview of the potential environmental impact that our
16 cleanup strategy might cause.

17 And the bottom line purpose of this meeting is to
18 collect public comment. And we're going to do that in
19 two ways. First of all, before I get to the agenda,
20 we're going to do that in two ways on the public comment
21 though. I'm going to give a brief presentation where
22 you can ask questions. Then we'll take a break, and
23 afterwards they'll be a formal public comment detail.

24 But before we get to the details, there's a couple
25 of people I'd like to introduce that work with me on

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 this project. I'd like each one to stand up. The first
2 one is Bob Boggs. He works with the Department of Toxic
3 Substances Control. That is a state agency. Bob, would
4 you like to say anything?

5 MR. BOGGS: Well, as he said, there will be an
6 opportunity for comments. Comments can be submitted
7 tonight orally, and they will be recorded.
8 Alternatively, I'm the regulatory agency contact. My
9 information will be presented later. If you have
10 comments that you'd like to present to us only, you can
11 present them to me as well. And the President Trust
12 through Craig will also receive comments on what's being
13 proposed tonight. Thanks.

14 MR. COOPER: Also here tonight is Jim Ponton.
15 He's with the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
16 It's another state agency that has regulatory authority
17 here at the Presidio.

18 MR. PONTON: It's nice to be here, and I'd
19 like to say that I'm available if you want to ask me any
20 questions. I have some business cards available. I
21 work with Bob and with Craig and Chris and Brian. We're
22 all part of a team. We all have different perspectives,
23 but we all have a common perspective of doing the right
24 thing, protecting the environment. Please feel free to
25 ask me any questions.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Also with us is Brian Ullensvang
2 from the National Park Service.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: I want to thank you all for
4 coming tonight and join with the others.

5 MR. COOPER: And again, my name is Craig
6 Cooper with the Presidio Trust. George Ford is also
7 with the Presidio Trust and he is our construction
8 manager and will be leading up our cleanup efforts,
9 supervising our cleanup efforts at these two sites that
10 we're going to be talking about tonight.

11 Let's go over the agenda really fast. Again, I'm
12 going to give a presentation, again about what are these
13 landfills? What are we planning to do to clean them up?
14 And then we'll take a short break.

15 But during the presentation, I really want to keep
16 this as informal as possible, so you can ask any
17 clarifying questions you have. If I use something that
18 you didn't quite understand or get, please stop me so
19 you can ask questions at that point in time. But please
20 remember that any questions or comments you make during
21 this portion don't count as official comments. You need
22 to restate them during the official public comment
23 period that will happen after the break. Okay. Without
24 any further ado, let's jump into my presentation.

25 Basically, let's talk a little bit about process

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and what happens after this public meeting. We are in
2 the middle of a public comment period that is required
3 by federal and state law when you are cleaning up a
4 hazardous waste site. And the public comment period
5 will probably be extended to approximately July 15, and
6 we'll talk about that tonight in more detail.

7 We're at tonight's meeting which is required by
8 state and federal law to hold a public meeting during a
9 public comment period before we make any final decision.
10 So the Presidio Trust -- we'll have to write a response
11 to comments. That's all the comments that we receive
12 tonight, all comments that we receive in writing during
13 the public comment period, either by E-mail or by
14 regular mail. The Presidio Trust has to write a formal
15 written response to each and every comment that we
16 receive. And then we will finalize a document that's
17 under public review right now, and I'll talk about that
18 document. It's called the Draft Remedial Action Plan.

19 So that's our cleanup strategy basically for
20 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. So we have a draft one
21 right now. We have a public meeting and public comment
22 period where we get comments. We write a final RAP and
23 we submit that to Bob's agency and Jim's agency for
24 approval. And if those two regulatory agencies are
25 comfortable with the final Remedial Action Plan and they

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 approve it, then the Presidio Trust is ready to move
2 forward with the cleanup by October of this year. So
3 that's the overall schedule that we're hoping to make
4 for these two projects.

5 So a little bit about these two landfills. First
6 of all, I want to tell you where they are located at the
7 Presidio. So we're over here at the Officers' Club in
8 the Main Post, and Landfill Four is here and Fill Site
9 five is over here, over in the Coastal Bluffs Western
10 Portion of the Presidio. If you can't read this map
11 very well, this is Washington Boulevard here, this is
12 Lincoln, and this is the World War II Memorial. So you
13 go just a little bit uphill from the World War II
14 Memorial, and it's Fill Site 5. And Landfill 4 is a
15 much smaller landfill right near an area called Central
16 Magazine.

17 So a bit of background regarding these two
18 landfills -- and they're both landfills. Fill site is
19 just another name for landfill. These are names that
20 the army gave these two landfills historically, and the
21 and President Trust has continued to use the Army
22 nomenclature for these sites.

23 Basically, Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 are primarily
24 composed of building debris and municipal waste. They
25 have slightly different histories, as you can see from

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 this slide, but based on our characterization studies
2 and sampling that we have carried out at these two
3 sites, we believe they're mostly due to historic
4 disposal by the army in these timeframes of building
5 debris and municipal waste. The only thing that's
6 different at Landfill 4, it's possible that the army may
7 have disposed of some chemical waste in Landfill 4 also.
8 As far as the size, you could see Fill Site 5 is quite a
9 bit larger than Landfill 4 far as its estimated volume.

10 As I said, we've done some sampling of the soil in
11 the landfills and of the waste. We have a fancy word
12 for contaminants. It's called Chemicals of Concern.
13 Chemicals of Concern are contaminants that have been
14 detected above our cleanup levels for the most part.

15 So at Landfill 4, we have a variety of chemicals of
16 concern. But they fall into major categories that are
17 basically metals, pesticides, PCBs and petroleum
18 hydrocarbons. So those are the types of chemicals that
19 are above our cleanup levels at that landfill.

20 At Fill Site 5, there's fewer Chemicals Of concern.
21 It's primarily lead with pesticides. So that's what's
22 in the soil and in the waste basically in these
23 landfills.

24 Underneath each of these landfills is a
25 water-bearing unit called groundwater, and we do have

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 some limited groundwater sampling at both sites that
2 indicate that the contaminate levels are below cleanup
3 levels. We did get one detected -- some chlorinated
4 solvents -- but that hasn't reoccurred, so we can think
5 that's probably a false positive. And it is true that
6 we do plan on doing additional groundwater monitoring at
7 both of these sites to make sure that groundwater has
8 not been impacted at these sites. But for the most
9 part, we believe that the groundwater is not impacted at
10 this point in time.

11 Okay. So that's a little bit of history about
12 these two landfills of how they were created, what they
13 consist of, what the contaminants are. So that's the
14 first phase that we went through in our studies.

15 And then the next phase is basically, well, what
16 are we going to do about it? Remedial Action Objectives
17 are our overall goals. What are we trying to achieve if
18 we take a cleanup action at these sites? So they're
19 just general accomplishments.

20 When we say the word "done," what do we want to be
21 able to say that we've accomplished at these sites? We
22 definitely want to protect human health and the
23 environment. That's Goal No. 1 at any of our cleanups.
24 We definitely want to be consistent with future land use
25 of where the Presidio wants to use land for the Presidio

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 National Park. If possible, it would be great to
2 recycle or reuse the landfill materials. And, of
3 course, any action we take to clean up these landfills
4 have to comply with state and federal laws. So those
5 are our general goals.

6 So once you've set up your goals of what you're
7 trying to accomplish, then you set up different
8 alternatives, various ways to try to accomplish those
9 goals. And before I go too further, the document that
10 I'm basically summarizing tonight's presentation is this
11 document right here. There's a copy of it on the table
12 there. This is the Draft Remedial Action Plan. My
13 presentation is a brief summary of this particular
14 document.

15 So, anyway, getting back to the presentation, we
16 set up these alternatives to try to -- how are we going
17 to accomplish these cleanups? So the Presidio Trust
18 analyzed four different alternatives for each of these
19 landfills.

20 One is no action. Basically don't do anything and
21 see what happens. Each alternative has an estimated
22 cost associated with it. Those costs include, by the
23 way, both the capital costs, which is the construction
24 cost, and the present worth of any long-term or
25 short-term operation of maintenance cost. And I'll talk

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 about that in a bit.

2 So the first alternative that we analyzed was no
3 action. That's basically used as a baseline. It's
4 required by both state and federal law to analyze. So
5 you can take a look at what would be the results if you
6 just left those landfills alone. There's a small costs
7 involved in that with respect to abandoning some
8 existing groundwater monitoring wells. But basically
9 there is no cost or minimal cost associated with that
10 particular alternative.

11 Institutional controls is a fancy word for
12 basically leaving the sites alone and not taking any
13 action physically at the site but setting up different
14 institutional requirements basically to keep people away
15 from the sites. For example, you could set up a deed
16 restriction to make it clear that if anyone wanted --
17 the Presidio Trust wanted to redevelop this area -- it
18 would be really clear that we couldn't redevelop these
19 landfills in a way that was incompatible with what we
20 have there.

21 Institutional controls. An example of that would
22 be our Presidio Trust Management Plan. And that's our
23 land use document that sets up what is an allowable use
24 or reuse within the area via the Presidio National Park.
25 So we can use that. So it's basically a paper control.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Another type of institutional control is basically
2 putting up fences to keep people away from the
3 landfills. So those are various types of institutional
4 controls that we took a look at for these sites.

5 Another alternative that we looked at is called a
6 cap. Basically you leave the waste in place, but you
7 cover the waste -- a question. Yes?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why are the institutional
9 controls \$4 million? What's the basis of that figure?
10 It just seems high.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's groundwater monitoring.

12 MR. COOPER: It's groundwater monitoring.
13 Right. So even if we set up these paper controls and
14 fences and so on, we'd still have to monitor the
15 groundwater for 30 years.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So that \$4 million, a
17 majority of that probably also is included in the
18 capping or other, you know --

19 MR. COOPER: Right. Yeah. You mean
20 groundwater monitoring?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That type, yes.

22 MR. COOPER: With capping, you still have to
23 do groundwater monitoring also. So capping again is you
24 leave the waste in place, and you basically will put a
25 cover over the waste in accordance with state and

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 federal law. There's various types of allowable
2 landfill caps. But you would still have to conduct
3 long-term groundwater monitoring. Because whenever you
4 leave waste in place, there is always a threat that the
5 waste will -- and contaminants in the waste -- will
6 leach down and get into groundwater. So the estimated
7 cost of the capping alternative is approximately
8 6.7 million.

9 And then the fourth alternative that we took a look
10 at is excavation, which means dig out the waste,
11 recycling of any portions of the waste that is
12 appropriate to recycle, and then haul away the
13 contaminated fill and soil and waste to an authorized
14 landfill off-site. And this is our fourth alternative.
15 It's estimated cost is 7.3 million. This one has
16 groundwater monitoring for only three years as required
17 under state and federal law because all the waste is
18 gone. So theoretically the thinking is there is not a
19 long-term risk to groundwater quality, and three years
20 of groundwater monitoring would be appropriate for that.

21 So we have some alternatives. And then we have to
22 analyze these alternatives to decide which one is the
23 best alternative. In accordance with federal law,
24 CERCLA evaluation criteria. CERCLA basically is the
25 federal hazardous waste law that we have to use for

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 cleaning up these remediation sites, these hazardous
2 waste sites at the Presidio.

3 So the evaluation criteria, there is nine of them,
4 and they fall into three basic categories: Threshold
5 criteria, which is protectiveness of human health and
6 the environment and compliance with all state and
7 federal laws; balancing criteria, which is a variety of
8 difference types of criteria that we look at, cost and
9 effectiveness, and so on. And then at the end is
10 modifying criteria, which is how does the state
11 regulatory agencies feel about each proposed remedy, and
12 how does the community feel about it?

13 So basically the Presidio Trust can only work on
14 the first seven criteria at this point in time because
15 we're in the public comment period right now, and so
16 we're still receiving state and community comments. So
17 this one we really can't talk about too much. But we
18 can talk about these two, the threshold criteria, and
19 the balancing criteria.

20 Basically, as a rule of thumb, for an alternative
21 to be successful, it must score really high with
22 threshold criteria. It has to have full compliance with
23 the threshold criteria. If it doesn't, it can't be
24 selected as a preferred remedy. Balancing criteria is
25 about a series of trade offs. Some alternatives will be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 good in one category but bad in another. And that's
2 okay. So you look at the pros and cons of each
3 alternative under the balancing criteria.

4 So let's see how the four alternatives that we
5 looked at did against the threshold and balancing
6 criteria. Here's the four alternatives again that I've
7 talked about: No action, the institutional controls,
8 the capping and the excavation. To make this table
9 simple, I went by just the two groups of criteria that I
10 discussed before, the threshold criteria and the
11 balancing criteria. A full discussion of this analysis
12 is in this document.

13 And so basically the first two alternatives, as you
14 can see, did not fare very well with either the
15 threshold or balancing criteria. So it really boiled
16 down to a comparison of the capping alternative with the
17 excavation alternative. Both capping and excavation
18 scored fine on the threshold criteria, so theoretically
19 either one of these could be selected as the preferred
20 or recommended alternative. But at the Presidio Trust,
21 when we took these two alternatives into the balancing
22 criteria and compared cost with effectiveness and the
23 other criteria, we felt that the Alternative Four, the
24 excavation alternative, scored better and higher than
25 the capping alternative. And that's primarily because

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the capping alternative leaves waste in place that as
2 far as long-term effectiveness did not score as high, of
3 course, as the clean closure remedy.

4 So the Presidio Trust -- we are recommending for
5 both of these landfill sites, for both Landfill 4 and
6 Fill Site 5, our preferred alternative is to excavate
7 out the waste and remove it from the Presidio; recycle
8 any portions of the waste that is appropriate to recycle
9 and take all contaminated materials off-site for
10 appropriate disposal in a landfill off-site.

11 So our bottom line on why we are recommending
12 Alternative No. 4 is that we thought that it basically
13 was the best tradeoff of the criteria. As you can see
14 from our cost estimates, Alternative Four was
15 approximately 600 or \$700,000 more than Alternative
16 Three. So for \$700,000 more, we saw that we could dig
17 out these landfills and get a permanent, clean-closure
18 remedy in place for these two particular sites. We saw
19 that investment of an extra additional amount of money
20 well worth the while in the long run.

21 So that's the presentation of an overview of the
22 Draft Remedial Action plan. Again, there's a copy of
23 this plan at the Trust library that you can check out
24 and review and take home. This is really the plan that
25 we are soliciting comments on during the public comment

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 period.

2 Also in this plan -- because now I'm going to
3 switch gears a little bit and talk about -- okay. If
4 the Presidio Trust did get the approval from the state
5 agencies and the community to move forward with
6 Alternative Four and basically to implement Alternative
7 Four, what are the potential environmental impacts that
8 we need to consider while we implement this remedy? The
9 law that requires us to study the environmental impacts
10 of carrying out remedies or cleanups is a state law
11 called the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.
12 So the Presidio Trust, in coordination with Bob's
13 agency, the Department of Toxic Substances, we had to do
14 what's called an initial study of Alternative Four. And
15 we had to take a look at various types of potential
16 environment impacts, such as noise and dust and air
17 quality. How much noise will it create to dig up these
18 landfills? How much dust and impacts to air quality
19 will it create if we dig up these landfills and choose
20 Alternative Four? So basically you take a look at the
21 potential impacts before you move forward with a remedy.
22 That's what CEQA is about. The CEQA documents are in
23 Appendix C of the Draft Remedial Action Plan. And you
24 can see the details of that.

25 To sum up what the CEQA documents say, digging up

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the landfills, choosing Alternative Four, will basically
2 improve environmental quality because we're removing the
3 waste and will have no lasting negative impact. There
4 will be some negative impacts during construction, but
5 they can be mitigated down to acceptable levels.
6 Mitigated means to ameliorate or to make less, and
7 basically to bring them down to less than significant
8 impacts. For example, in the next slide I'll give you a
9 couple of examples, different types of mitigation that
10 we need to carry out if we were to implement Alternative
11 Four and dig out these landfills.

12 So this is kind of a close-up map of the two sites.
13 Here we are on the west side of the Presidio. Lincoln
14 Boulevard is over here. Here's Fill Site 5 and Landfill
15 4. And so the red zones -- basically we're going to
16 have -- to dig these landfills out, we're going to have
17 a lot of heavy equipment at both of these sites,
18 excavators, trucks coming in and out, excavators to dig
19 out the waste, trucks to receive the waste and to drive
20 the waste away. So the red areas here is portions of
21 the road that would have to be closed during the project
22 time. And also I wanted to point out that this portion
23 of Washington Boulevard -- unfortunately this map got
24 cut off -- but this portion of Washington Boulevard
25 would get closed during working hours. And that's to

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 help out with truck traffic so trucks can get in and get
2 out of that area quickly. The red areas would be
3 full-time road closures during the project time. And
4 again, our estimated project time is in the
5 October-November timeframe right now. That's an example
6 of when we went through the CEQA document and analyzed
7 the potential impacts, we realized there would be an
8 impact to traffic such as this.

9 Another impact to traffic are these trucks that
10 will be carrying the waste away from the landfills. So
11 this map, the dark line on the map, shows the authorized
12 entry and exits from the Presidio that the trucks can
13 follow to haul the waste away.

14 So here we are at Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 again.
15 And basically you can see that the black line is the
16 most direct route from the landfills to Doyle Drive and
17 the US highway there to get the waste to a landfill. So
18 as you could see, there isn't going to be any truck
19 hauling through a residential area by this way. So
20 basically trucks will receive waste, get up on Doyle
21 Drive. We don't know which landfill will be selected
22 yet to receive the waste, so we have various
23 alternatives for the trucks to drive. So if a landfill
24 is to the north, up, let's say in Sonoma County up that
25 way, the truck would head straight north to cross the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Golden Gate Bridge. If the landfill is to the east or
2 to the south, the trucks would still immediately get
3 right up on Doyle here and follow this to Richardson and
4 Lombard but stay on US 101 the whole way. And also one
5 thing that is missing from this map, the trucks would be
6 allowed also to go down Highway 1 and 19th Avenue, which
7 is also a state highway.

8 I'm just about done. One last thing I wanted to
9 mention before I close out my presentation is people
10 often times ask, "What are we going to do after the
11 cleanup is finished?" If we do implement Alternative
12 No. 4 and we dig out this waste, obviously that's going
13 to be very disruptive of existing vegetation that is at
14 both of these sites. So people always ask, "Well, so
15 what's the strategy for revegetating these remediation
16 sites if you excavate out the waste?"

17 There is a very specific strategy already in place
18 to do that. There is a document called the Vegetation
19 Management Plan. That document was jointly prepared by
20 the Presidio Trust with the National Park Service. It
21 lays out allowable revegetation strategies throughout
22 the entire Presidio. And, as it turns out, these two
23 particular sites fall in two different types of
24 vegetation zones. Landfill 4 is in the historic forest
25 zone, eucalyptus forest zone. So it will be replanted

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and restored as part of the historic forest. Fill Site
2 5 is in the native plant community zone, so it would be
3 replanted and restored to that. And there is a whole
4 separate analysis and studies underway to work out the
5 details regarding how we will replant Landfill 4 and
6 Fill Site 5 in a way that's consistent with the
7 Vegetation Management Plan. Okay.

8 Just to summarize one last time as far as next
9 steps and where do we go from here. The public comment
10 period was originally from June 3 to July 3. It needs
11 to be extended. There will be a public notice to extend
12 the public comment period due to some changes that we
13 made to the CEQA document. There will be notice in the
14 papers about that. And most likely another public
15 meeting.

16 I just wanted to give everyone a heads-up that the
17 public comment period will probably be extended to
18 mid-July sometime. You're encouraged to send in your
19 public comments at any point in time. And to be safe,
20 you can send them in before July 3. If it's after
21 July 3, you can give me a call and check to see when the
22 public comment period was extended to.

23 So again, after the closure of the public comment
24 period, the Presidio Trust writes the final decision
25 document Remedial Action Plan with a full response to

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 everybody's comments. And we'll send a copy of that to
2 the Trust library for the public to take a look at. And
3 we'll send copies of that document to the Regional Board
4 and to DTSC. They'll take look at it. If it's
5 satisfactory to them, we hope to get Agency approval by
6 August or September. And so the Presidio Trust can then
7 jump into action and start cleaning up those landfills
8 in October.

9 So that is the end of my presentation. We're going
10 to take a short break, and when we come back, we will
11 start the formal public comment period.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What's the duration of the
13 plan? In other words, how long will it take to dig out
14 both landfills? And how long will the roads be closed
15 and (INAUDIBLE)?

16 MR. COOPER: Right now, our current estimate
17 to dig out both landfills is in the vicinity of about
18 six to eight weeks. So those roads -- for the red
19 zones, they would be closed full time during that six-
20 to eight-week period. And the blue zone, that little
21 stretch of Washington Boulevard, would just be closed
22 during working hours, when the trucks are moving, during
23 that six- to eight-week period.

24 Any other clarifying questions? This is your
25 chance to ask questions about this recommendation by the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Presidio Trust.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you have provisions for
3 monitoring during excavation to make sure -- you might
4 run into some unforeseen toxic problem, historic relics,
5 or whatever.

6 MR. COOPER: Right. In the Remedial Action
7 Plan, it specified -- the answer to that is yes, we have
8 monitoring plans. We have a whole variety of monitoring
9 plans, basically. There is a whole variety of laws that
10 we need to comply with when we carry this cleanup
11 action. Notice I kind of summarized that by just
12 saying, "comply with state and federal laws." Well,
13 this document specifies exactly which state and federal
14 laws we need to comply with when we dig up these
15 landfills. For example, we need to comply with the
16 National Historic Preservation Act. The Presidio Trust
17 has an archeologist that will come out and do routine
18 inspections when we're digging through this. These two
19 landfills, we don't expect anything of any historic
20 significance. It's not in any of our high archeological
21 sensitive zones. But to be on the safe side, we will
22 have a monitor out there.

23 We also have to monitor for air quality and dust
24 we need to keep down throughout the entire project, so
25 we will have dust monitors up, and because of the type

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 of natural soils that we may encounter underneath the
2 landfills. One type of natural soil is called
3 serpentinite that naturally consists of asbestos. We
4 also will have asbestos monitoring when we start digging
5 into the natural serpentinite soils. That's yet another
6 type of air quality monitoring in place.

7 We don't expect it, but if we run into a drum or a
8 brace or something like, we have a Contingency Plan in
9 place for that because that would require special
10 handling. And the type of waste that we're expecting is
11 construction debris and not any type of liquid or
12 significant finding of hazardous waste. But we will
13 have air quality monitors in place and trained
14 professionals there to monitor, to make sure that we
15 don't dig into something that we did not expect. And if
16 we do, we'll stop and take the appropriate actions at
17 that time.

18 MR. BOGGS: You may just want to clarify
19 regarding the road closures that we are actually
20 providing a detour that's required. It's a very short
21 little detour. So you're really not chopping off
22 anybody's traffic. It's a nice way for people to get
23 through.

24 MR. COOPER: They'll be signs up directing
25 people on how the detour will go. In fact, that's

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 another plan. We have to do the Transportation Plan
2 that will spell out exactly how we're going to do the
3 road closures; what type of barriers we're going to put
4 up; where we're going to put the detour signs, etc.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are you saying that between
6 now and maybe June 15, you're changing only the CEQA
7 part of the document? So that if anyone were to comment
8 on the Remedial Action Proposal itself, that's not going
9 to change? What you've already disseminated is what --

10 MR. COOPER: That's right. The Trust
11 recommendation for Alternative 4 is not changing. What
12 is changing a little bit is the documentation
13 regarding -- the CEQA documents are. The documentation
14 or analysis of the potential environmental impacts that
15 choosing Alternative 4 would cause. So that's the only
16 change.

17 All right. I just want to remind everybody, when
18 we get into the formal public comment period, I can't
19 answer any questions. I can answer questions after the
20 meeting informally. This is your last chance to ask
21 questions.

22 MR. NELSON: The road closure applies to dog
23 walkers, pedestrians and bicyclists as well. It's just
24 completely closed?

25 MR. FORD: I can jump in there. There will be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 detours on the roads for bicycles and motor vehicles.
2 We are going to be installing some paths for
3 pedestrians, dog walkers that will be off the road, but
4 it will lead around the site. The pedestrian detours
5 will be significantly shorter than the vehicle detours.
6 People who are walking or running won't be sent hundreds
7 of yards out of their way.

8 MR. BERMAN: In the reuse activities, do you
9 expect in the landfills to have any pedestrian traffic
10 in the areas where the landfills now exist?

11 MR. COOPER: Right.

12 MR. BERMAN: Do you expect to have trails or
13 other ways that people would travel through those areas
14 by premeditated plans, not just by wandering through
15 there one day, but by actually having trails provided
16 halfway through there?

17 MR. COOPER: You mean, after the vegetation is
18 in place, do we have plans for walking trails through
19 the remediation sites? I do not know. Terri, do you
20 know?

21 MS. THOMAS: (INAUDIBLE) Presidio Path
22 Bikeways Plan which is being worked on right now and
23 probably will be out next year for public review. So
24 that's a whole separate thing.

25 MR. BERMAN: In the tentative plan, will there

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 be trails or pedestrian pathways, something through the
2 areas that are now explicitly identified as Landfill 4
3 Fill Site 5, to your knowledge?

4 MR. COOPER: I do not know. The landfills
5 will be clean enough, definitely, for that type of
6 reuse, so that shouldn't be a problem. Whether the
7 Presidio Trust actually ends up through this trail and
8 pathway strategy, if they end up aligning one of their
9 trails and pathways to go through Fill Site 5 or
10 Landfill 4, I don't know if that decision has been made
11 at this point in time. So it's different
12 decision-making group. But if you would like that to be
13 a recommendation, you can make that during the public
14 comment period, and we can pass that on to the
15 appropriate group at the Presidio Trust.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What would the terrain be
17 like in each of these areas after the excavation?

18 MR. FORD: We expect to essentially restore
19 the pre-filled topography. Both of these sites have had
20 wedge-shaped bodies of fill placed on them, which had
21 the effect of leveling them out. As we dig out the
22 wedge of fill, both of them will become kind of
23 down-slope areas. We expect Landfill 4, when we get
24 down to native soil, will basically slope gently towards
25 the north. Fill Site 5, the topography is likely to be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 a little more complicated. It may actually have a
2 couple of ravines that come to a head on the site. The
3 truth is at this point we don't know precisely what the
4 topography will be. And so what we want to do is dig
5 through the fill, and when we hit native, we would stop
6 digging. And then we complete that process over the
7 whole site. Then we'll take a look and see what we have
8 and see if it looks like native topography and if it's
9 stable. And if that's the case, then we would leave it,
10 or maybe just do a minimum finish grade.

11 When we've removed all the fill, if we find that
12 the topography of the native soil is too rough or too
13 steep or something like that so that it's not going to
14 be that safe final configuration, then we'll do a little
15 more grading to leave something that will not erode
16 excessively. The final topography will really be
17 established as we get to the end of the project.

18 MR. COOPER: Any other questions? All right.
19 Thank very much for listening. We'll take a short
20 break. When we reconvene, we'll do the formal public
21 comment period. We'll probably reconvene at ten minutes
22 after 7:00.

23 (Recess taken.)

24 MR. COOPER: The next portion of this meeting
25 is the formal public comment period. This is open to

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 anybody who wants to make a comment about any portion of
2 my presentation; any portion of the Draft Remedial
3 Action Plan, the proposed plan for action that we've
4 mailed out. If you have any comment that you would like
5 to make about what the right thing to do is for Landfill
6 4 and Fill Site 5, this is your opportunity. So for
7 purposes of the court reporter to hear you properly, I
8 would ask that if you have a comment you would state
9 your name; if you're representing any type of agency or
10 public interest group say that, and then just speak up
11 and your comments will be recorded for the record. It
12 would be best, if you're not too shy, please come to the
13 front of the room and you can speak in front of the
14 microphone. It's not required if you don't want to do
15 that, but it's really important that the court reporter
16 hears you for your comment to get recorded and it
17 becomes a part of the official transcripts for tonight's
18 meeting. Every comment that we receive we provide a
19 formal written response back to you. Any questions
20 about this portion of the meeting?

21 Again, on this portion of the meeting, I'm not
22 allowed to answer any questions other than any questions
23 about this portion of the meeting.

24 I did want to say again thanks very much for coming
25 tonight. I put a whole bunch of my business cards at

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the table over there. So first person who wants to make
2 a comment about tonight's meeting. Please come on up.

3 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Gerald Anderson.
4 And these comments are representative of myself as a
5 citizen. I'd like to support the Trust's proposed plan.
6 And there are two main considerations that are important
7 to me, one in the past and one for the future.

8 A consideration of the past is this plan does the
9 very most possible at this time to undo the environment
10 damage that's been done in the past. As far as the
11 future is concerned, I think this plan does the very
12 most feasible at this time to maximize the value of the
13 property as a national park and the asset to the
14 citizens and provide for their enjoyment in the future.

15 MS. CHEEVER: I'm Julie Cheever. I am a San
16 Francisco resident, and I'm also a member of the
17 Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, which is the
18 Citizen's Advisory Board for the Presidio cleanup. But
19 I'm making my comment as an individual citizen tonight.

20 The Restoration Advisory Board, or RAB, will be
21 considering a proposed comment at our Board meeting
22 later this evening, and that comment letter, if approved
23 at our meeting, will be our formal RAB comment on the
24 proposed remedial action. Meanwhile though, in my
25 comment right now, I'm going to incorporate some

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 references to previous positions taken by the RAB over
2 the past few years and other public comment. This is at
3 the suggestion of our RAB Planning Commission because we
4 thought it might be helpful to have some background
5 about public interest and public comment about this
6 issue over the years.

7 So the RAB has been following issues of landfill
8 cleanup since at least 1995, which is about the time
9 that the Army finished completing its plans for
10 petroleum cleanup and started concentrating on the
11 CERCLA cleanup.

12 It is my impression that about that time, the
13 existence of landfills on the Presidio was not very
14 widely known. I know that when I joined the RAB in late
15 1995, I was rather surprised and quite bemused to learn
16 that there were landfills on this beautiful landscape
17 that I enjoyed walking on and visiting. And
18 furthermore, that the landfills weren't what my first
19 thought of what a landfill was, which is someone filling
20 land because of land use -- although sometimes they were
21 made for that reason. Most times they were made at
22 least partly because this was a convenient place for the
23 army to dump municipal waste.

24 Furthermore, I learned that these landfills were
25 often quite extensive; that they weren't very thoroughly

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 investigated as to what was in them; that they were
2 often placed in ravines over creeks and streams, and
3 additionally that they were not very well engineered and
4 geologically unstable.

5 The first comment made by the RAB about landfills
6 was a Landfill Closure Resolution which was passed by a
7 17 to 2 vote by the RAB at one of our meetings in May
8 1997. This was before the army had announced its
9 proposals for the cleanup. But we had seen drafts of it
10 and discussed it a lot at RAB meetings and realized that
11 the army's proposals were mostly going to consist of
12 institutional controls. So our Landfill Closure
13 Resolution, five years ago, the bottom line was, "Be it
14 resolved that with few exceptions and until proven
15 otherwise, the Presidio landfills, fill sites and
16 deserted areas should be excavated and fill materials
17 recycled where appropriate and disposed of off site."

18 Some of the ideas we had in this is there shouldn't
19 be institutional controls on national parklands because
20 that would restrict use of the land; it was a good idea
21 to clear waste from groundwater saturation zones; that
22 recycling was a good idea, etc.

23 The next thing since that happened was the army put
24 out its proposed plan and its proposed Feasibility Study
25 for landfills throughout the Presidio, and in most cases

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 they did suggest institutional controls, which is land
2 use restrictions with excavation of hot spots at a
3 couple of sites and capping also at one or two sites.
4 This brought forth a very strong outpouring of comments
5 which were due September 1997.

6 This is the army's list of comments. 52
7 individuals, agencies and groups made comments,
8 including very long comments from agencies like the
9 Trust and the National Park Service, but also
10 neighborhood groups and environmental groups like the
11 Sierra Club, civic groups like the Chamber of Commerce.

12 Besides the 52 written comments, there were 15
13 spoken comments, some by the same people. And by my
14 count, all but two of these comments expressed strong
15 concerns about the army's plan and asked for stronger
16 cleanup. One of those comments was a comment letter by
17 RAB members. Now while we didn't pass it at the Board
18 meeting, we circulated it among ourselves. I think we
19 had five drafts of it. It was signed by 23 of our
20 current RAB members, and it asked for stronger cleanup
21 plans that included excavation.

22 As months wore on, and the army didn't respond to
23 any of the comments, we wrote another letter that was
24 similar. Again it was not passed by the Board, but this
25 one was signed by 15 RAB members, and it discussed 23

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 sites, including the ones at issue tonight, and again
2 asked for stronger cleanup, including excavation.

3 Finally this past spring the RAB at a Board meeting
4 wrote a letter saying it was pleased that the Trust and
5 the Park Service resolved differences about the
6 applicable requirements so that the cleanup could
7 proceed.

8 So these things I've mentioned about public
9 comments in the past, the comments have both reflected
10 and shaped my own opinion. So going back to my
11 individual comment, my comment is that it has been a
12 very long process, and I'm very glad that finally some
13 action is getting underway, and secondly that I strongly
14 support the proposed remedial alternative.

15 MR. COOPER: Anyone else?

16 MR. CARNAN: I'm Redmond Carnan, and I'm on
17 the PAR board as well as NAP. And I support the
18 preferred remedial alternative, and I look forward to
19 getting it done.

20 MR. COOPER: Who's next? All right. So the
21 public comment period is now closed. For you shy folks,
22 you can write in comments at this address to Bob and/or
23 I. Either place is fine. You can E-mail them in to Bob
24 and I before the end of the public comment period.
25 We'll go from there.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 No one else? All right. Well again, I'm going to
2 close this public meeting. Thank you very much for
3 coming. If anyone would like to stay tonight, there is
4 a Restoration Advisory Board meeting tonight. It's open
5 to the entire public. Every RAB meeting is open to the
6 public. And tonight, we're going to have Terri Thomas
7 from the Presidio Trust talk about revegetation and
8 restoration of remediation sites. So you're all
9 encouraged to stay, and we'll get that meeting started
10 in about five or ten minutes.

11 (The public meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.)

12 ---oOo---

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

THE OFFICER'S CLUB

BUILDING 50

JUNE 11, 2002

7:30 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the regular monthly
2 meeting of the Presidio of San Francisco Restoration
3 Advisory Board. We meet here the second Tuesday night
4 of every month. This is our regular meeting place. I'm
5 Mark Youngkin, duly-elected Community Co-chair. This is
6 Craig Cooper, Agency Co-chair. Our usual facilitator
7 Doug Kern cannot make it tonight. He had a rock
8 climbing accident and broke his leg. He'll be in
9 recovery for a while, and I'm filling in for him
10 tonight, so bear with me.

11 So let's move on to agenda approval. Does
12 everybody have a copy of the agenda?

13 Under announcements, we're going to add the
14 introduction of the new public relations person. I know
15 that's not the right title, but we'll get to that. And
16 also under 5A, somewhere on there, add the discussion of
17 our RAB support letter for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.
18 We're sort of talking about Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5
19 in this project status update. Maybe add a third bullet
20 under 5A, discussion of RAB letter. Sound good to
21 everybody?

22 Any other changes, additions? Consider the agenda
23 approved? Thank you.

24 Moving on to announcements and old business. I'll
25 turn it over to Craig Cooper.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Mark and fellow RAB members,
2 there's two people I want to introduce tonight. First I
3 want to introduce Terri Thomas. She works for the
4 Presidio Trust. She's the Natural Resource Program
5 Manager for the Presidio Trust. She was gracious enough
6 to agree to do a presentation tonight regarding
7 restoration and revegetation of our remediation sites.
8 I'm excited and happy that Terri can be here tonight.
9 Thanks, Terri.

10 And also I want to introduce, if you haven't met
11 her already tonight, Anna Fitten-Hathaway. Anna is the
12 Trust Community Involvement Coordinator for the
13 Remediation Program. She's going to be helping out in
14 setting up public meetings like this, working with RAB
15 members on the newsletter, the cleanup news, and other
16 community involvement activities as appropriate. If you
17 haven't met Anna already, please do so. Anna, would you
18 like to say anything?

19 MS. HATHAWAY: I'm looking forward to working
20 with all of you and learning more about the remediation
21 program and the different interests involved. I'm from
22 Maine.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. Committee business
24 and reports. I usually do that. Let me just check my
25 notes here.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 We had our Planning Committee meeting on May 28th.
2 This is our regularly scheduled committee meeting. We
3 had it the fourth Tuesday of every month. It's in
4 Building 1750. On that evening, we discussed the
5 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 Remedial Action Plan most of
6 the evening in preparation for this public meeting. So
7 we talked about that quite a bit.

8 We also talked about financial reporting. We went
9 over a financial template that Craig is trying to put
10 together to use for financial data. We ended up talking
11 about the Plug-in Removal Action Plan Work Plan for
12 contingency sites at the Presidio. We discussed that
13 and the presentation by Craig and the Trust.

14 Our next meeting will be the fourth Tuesday of this
15 month. June 25th, Building 1750 at 7:00 o'clock, their
16 regularly-scheduled meeting.

17 Okay. Moving on to Committee Business and Reports.
18 Jan, anything you want to talk about?

19 MS. MONAGHAN: No.

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: Item No. 5. Reports and
21 discussions. No. A. Project status update,
22 Presidio-wide programs.

23 Our first bullet is restoration of remediation
24 sites. Terri Thomas of Presidio Trust.

25 MS. THOMAS: Thanks Mark. I'm going to talk

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 to you tonight about how we're going to approach what to
2 put on top of the site after they're remediated, the
3 vegetation, and also some of the restoration aspects
4 that might be involved in topographic changes. So what
5 I'll do is I'll talk to you first about the process that
6 we're going to be going through to determine what will
7 be on those sites, and then I'll talk about the specific
8 projects for this fall, Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. And
9 then I'll talk to you about how the vegetation
10 management planning process and the program actually
11 implements the plan, so you can see a little bit about
12 that as well.

13 So to start with, the Vegetation Management Plan
14 was an approved document last year. It's a joint
15 document between the National Park Service and the
16 Presidio Trust. It dictates the different areas that
17 have different treatments as far as revegetation or
18 restoration.

19 The map behind me here has those areas on it. The
20 dark green is the historic forests, which are part of
21 the historic landmark designation for the Presidio.
22 They're very important to that historic landmark
23 designation.

24 The light green are the natural areas. These are
25 areas where we restore natural processes and native

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 plants. And the yellow areas are the landscape zones.
2 So those are the design landscapes. And oftentimes
3 they're historic as well, although they're not at all
4 times.

5 Superimposed on top of that -- and I noticed when I
6 was in the back, I couldn't see this -- are little red
7 lines, circles of the remediation sites. And if you
8 look at those, there are quite a few of them that are
9 actually in the natural areas. If you look on the areas
10 of the coast, these kind of in the back it just kind of
11 looks blotches, but they're actually remediation sites.

12 The ones in the light green, the natural areas,
13 actually take a lot longer to restore and have a longer,
14 more complicated process to go through because you're
15 actually trying to restore a natural system. And I
16 wanted to give you an idea about what that means.

17 This restoration implementation timeline deals with
18 the way that we restore the natural areas. And as you
19 can see, the planning needs to actually start about two
20 years before the construction of the remediation site.
21 This is very important, because there's a lot of initial
22 studies that need to be done regarding the soils,
23 regarding the hydrology in the area, what kind of
24 topography it used to be like; a lot of historic
25 information on what the typography used to look like in

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the area, as well as trying to create a plant list for
2 those sites that would be viable, ecological and
3 appropriate for those areas.

4 As you can see in this particular one, we did start
5 the planning process at the beginning of 2001, the blue,
6 but we had a large gap where no work was done until
7 right now. And that large gap was because of just a lot
8 of the uncertainty and the timing of the remediation
9 sites and the remediation programs. We kind of had
10 gotten up with the other sites getting restored and then
11 kind of backed off. So what we're hoping for in the
12 future is a much more efficient timeline. So really,
13 right now, we're kind of catching up to do Fill Site 5
14 in a very efficient and effective way.

15 But we were able to in 2001 start to develop a
16 plant list. And as you can tell, the plants, the
17 propagation takes 18 months. And this was prior to site
18 construction. Because we can't just go out to a nursery
19 and buy the plants here in the Presidio. The plants
20 need to be collected from the plants that are right here
21 in the Presidio in the natural areas.

22 Well, there aren't too many. Our plant palette and
23 the amount of plants that are here are very limited. So
24 we have to collect the seeds very carefully and over
25 time. And that's one of the reasons why you'll see that

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 there are two phases of restoration, generally, for each
2 site. Because you can only collect a certain amount of
3 seeds from our propagule sources each year. And so we
4 can only grow those in the nursery for each year.

5 So if we have a change order in the middle of a
6 contract, it's not as easy for us because it takes 18
7 months to get your plants back again that you decide
8 aren't appropriate for your site.

9 Then once the site's remediated, you actually see
10 what you have underneath the site and what you can
11 revegetate. So sometimes there are some changes in the
12 vegetation.

13 So after the site is remediated, there's a first
14 vegetation and erosion control, then massive intensive
15 invasive plant control. It's really the non-native
16 weeds that can come in and take over a site very quickly
17 and effectively, because a lot of them are adapted to
18 the disturbed site. But we need to make sure we keep on
19 top of that.

20 And then a second phase of revegetation followed by
21 really about eight years of maintenance and monitoring.
22 So it's not a short quick fix like hydro-seeding.

23 On the other hand, it gives us an amazing
24 opportunity. There aren't too many places -- I've been
25 asking around -- there aren't too many places where I've

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 actually gone that people have restored natural
2 processes on top of remediation sites. So we feel like
3 we're really breaking some new ground and we're really
4 excited about it. And we hope that we'll be able set
5 some type of precedent and spread the word that this is
6 a great way to restore sites after remediation.

7 I'll get a little bit now into this fall's
8 projects. Oh, it didn't come out as colorful. These
9 are the Western slopes of the Presidio. You can kind of
10 tell that there is a greenish-gray tinge here. And then
11 about here it changes into kind of a yellow-brown tinge.
12 Those are the two soil types that we have underneath the
13 remediation sites in the areas of Landfill 4 and Fill
14 Site 5.

15 This greenish is the serpentinite that Craig
16 mentioned earlier, and then dune sand. These sites,
17 especially Fill Site 5, is very interesting because it
18 really comes right at contact point between the
19 serpentinite and the dune. So they come together right
20 under Fill Site 5. We're not really sure how much of
21 each we're going to have once the site's remediated.

22 So to start with Landfill 4, as Craig mentioned in
23 his presentation earlier, Landfill 4 is in the historic
24 forest zone. And the historic forest in this area was
25 plant with a eucalyptus tree known as Blue Gum

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Eucalyptus or eucalyptus globulus. This particular tree
2 species is a very messy species. It's also hazardous.
3 Limbs fall quite often. It's high fire danger, and it
4 just hasn't been the best species in the historic
5 forest. So in the Education Management Plan it did say
6 that we would be looking at a variety of other
7 eucalyptus species that might be able to have the
8 historic character that's required of an historic forest
9 in those sites.

10 So our goals for Landfill 4 are twofold. The first
11 is to retain that historic forest visual elements that
12 contribute to the Presidio landmark status. The
13 characteristics involved here are being studied right
14 now by a whole separate group of people involved at Penn
15 State and the Center for the Study of Historic
16 Landscapes at Olmstead Center, at Marsh Fillings
17 Rockefeller Historic Site. There's a group of experts
18 dealing with the historic forest that are looking at the
19 characterization and have identified for us what it
20 would be on this site, which is eucalyptus.

21 So we're also going to be testing several other
22 eucalyptus species that are noted here, and they're
23 growing right now at the Presidio Nursery and at Golden
24 Gate Park Nursery to see if their character could be
25 consistent with the character that's going to be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 identified by our historic forest study. So this site
2 is kind of like a pilot project. It's a study site.
3 We're going to be planting all of those different
4 species to see which one or many of them will be most
5 appropriate for this site and other sites on the
6 Presidio in the future.

7 I should probably mention that already on this site
8 there have been trees removed. Probably a lot of you
9 know about that. Actually just over the site of the
10 area that would need to be excavated. We always will
11 need to clear vegetation off of the site to be excavated
12 generally prior to bird-nesting season each year. So a
13 lot of times you'll see the plant removal or the tree
14 removal kind of prior to the construction timeline, and
15 it's for ecological reasons.

16 Now Fill Site 5 is the one that's right on the edge
17 of the serpentine and the dunes. It's going to be
18 restored to native plants. It's in the natural area
19 zone. And so the plants that are being propagated right
20 now are native plants. Like I mentioned, we aren't
21 really exactly sure how much serpentine, how much dune
22 we're going to have, as well as because of the lack of
23 propagules, it's not going to all be revegetated at once
24 in this fall/winter season. It will be in two phases.
25 And the main goal Fill Site 5 is to restore both the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 native ground surface, the topography, and the
2 vegetation as it existed prior to the land filling
3 activities on, I guess, it's approximately 3.8 acres
4 that we're going to be working with.

5 Now the two pictures you see here, the upper
6 picture is the coastal dune scrub, which would be in the
7 dune areas, the sand areas. And the lower picture is a
8 serpentine grassland, which is a type of community we're
9 aiming towards if we have serpentine exposed in the
10 site. So these aren't what they're going to look like
11 initially, but it's our long-term target.

12 So the next site that we're also kind of starting
13 to plan right now, but we aren't even far enough along
14 to tell you our goals, are Baker Beach Disturbed Areas
15 3,4, Fill Site 6, and Disturbed Areas 1, 1A, 2 and 2A.
16 And we're starting to get those started now because of
17 that long planning timeline in the beginning. We're
18 trying to get back on our good timing schedule so that
19 we'll have more information at this point in time when
20 they're being restored.

21 I'll tell you a little bit about Vegetation
22 Management Plan implementation. It's a different
23 process than the remediation process. So we have kind
24 of different public input and a different way of
25 implementing things. We don't generally do it with

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 large contracts. We do it with community-based
2 volunteers. We include the public. We include
3 scientific institutions. It's a pretty exciting
4 program, and it's been in place for several years. The
5 program is a three-way partnership. It's a partnership
6 of the National Park Service, the Presidio Trust, and
7 the Golden Gate Park Association. And it's been going
8 on like that since the Trust, for four years or so. And
9 before that, it was still the Park Service Park
10 Association program. It uses the expertise that's
11 available on those staffs as well as the expertise
12 that's available through local scientific institutions
13 that are kind of surrogate partners to us as well for
14 those places that need that kind of expertise. So in
15 the initial planning, in overseeing a lot of plant
16 propagation, outplanting, monitoring, and research,
17 they're all done with the expertise.

18 But when you actually get on-site planting or
19 growing the plants in the nursery, there is a variety of
20 people that can be included. There's programs with
21 school districts, programs with staff, staff day, and
22 programs with drop-in volunteers. And these happen
23 every week or every month. You have regular workdays
24 that we invite the community in to see exactly how we
25 restore things and the value of natural ecosystems. And

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the same thing for outplanting. So once the plants are
2 grown in the nursery, that whole first phase when
3 they're actually outplanted onto the site -- they're
4 also done with volunteers and with oversight from
5 ecologists and the staff of the Park Service or for the
6 Trust.

7 The next phase, which is weeding -- and actually
8 I'll show you two things. This is what a site looks
9 like when it's just being planted. The plants are very
10 small. There's not a whole lot of vegetation on the
11 site. It looks like a lot of bare ground. This is why
12 there is a very intensive weeding process in this
13 beginning because a disturbed site really attracts
14 weeds. And so you have to keep weeding.

15 But it's very important to put those plants out
16 small because that's the way they get adapted to that
17 native soil and to the climate that they're going to
18 need to exist in. If we pamper the plants too long in
19 the nursery; if we planted trees that were this tall
20 (indicating), their roots would be bound up around the
21 pot; they'd be put in native soil from compost that they
22 just love to grow in. There are things that just are
23 not adaptive for them. It's better for them to get in
24 the ground small, and you'll have much higher
25 survivorship. And since there's an incredible

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 investment that goes into every single one of these
2 plants, the survivorship is critical. They need to be
3 outplanted small, so it kind of needs to look like this.
4 We need some intensive weeding for a while. But if the
5 plants grow and you have a larger cover, you still need
6 to weed. And that's why you still need to make sure
7 that although this ends up being over five to eight
8 years until that ecosystem is stable enough that it can
9 take off and go on its own --

10 So that's one thing. I didn't want you to think
11 that it would look perfect right away. The plants will
12 be small. And it might be even less planted because
13 like I said, we don't have that many propagules.

14 This is a picture very recently. This is at
15 Inspiration Point. It was a revegetation site this last
16 fall. It's a good example, if you want to see what a
17 two-phase restoration looks like. Because out there,
18 part of the site's planted, and it's starting to look
19 pretty good, and the rest of the site looks like this,
20 landscape fabric and rice straw. The landscape fabric
21 keeps the woods out. The rice straw just kind of helps
22 the aesthetics, so it doesn't look like it's totally
23 covered with black plastic. But it's important that
24 this happen in two phases generally because we don't
25 have the right kinds of plants in the right amount. So

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 just kind of giving you an idea of what it might look
2 like right away.

3 But in the long term, the future visual, if we can
4 keep this process going in those natural areas, if we
5 can keep weeding, if we can keep that eight-year
6 monitoring maintenance, it will have some really great
7 looks in the future. It will be part of those natural
8 ecosystems. And we actually have been doing this on
9 some of the sites here in the Presidio. So it isn't
10 something that the program is inexperienced in. The
11 Park Service has been doing it at Golden Gate since
12 1983, which was their first restoration program. So
13 they've been doing it for several years.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Where is that picture taken?

15 MS. THOMAS: Actually, this picture was in
16 Fort Funston. I couldn't not use it because it was just
17 so gorgeous. The only reason that it's at Fort Funston
18 is because that's where this colorful picture was taken.
19 But I hadn't seen this exact same display at Baker
20 Beach.

21 In March at Baker Beach, you get wildflower
22 displays that match any Japanese garden. They're just
23 incredible. You just have to get out there at the right
24 time to get that picture right there.

25 MS. YAROS: When these areas are finished,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 will they be roped off? How will you maintain that
2 look? People just walk on them?

3 MS. THOMAS: Well, the sites that I'm thinking
4 about that has that look aren't roped off. They're the
5 sites on the bluff, and there are not any that are roped
6 off. The areas that we've restored so far, the Lobos
7 Dunes area, it's not roped. It has a boardwalk that
8 goes through it. It does have access (INAUDIBLE)
9 through it. And part of the desire of the program here
10 and at Golden Gate as a whole is to actually encourage
11 recreation through the restoration process as well, to
12 bring people into those sites, and help with those
13 sites.

14 So in general, we've been able to have areas, to
15 have access as well as protecting the plants. But
16 that's once they're established. You're right. Exactly
17 what they look like that. When they look like this,
18 they're stronger. In the initial times when we need do
19 a lot of weeding when the plants are really fragile,
20 there will be protective barriers. But it's for that
21 initial restoration effort to make sure that they get
22 their start, and then generally those are taken down.
23 And whenever possible, we try to fit access into the
24 programs. And generally that comes from a different
25 input from the trails folks. I don't decide what the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 access is through the site. That comes through kind of
2 when they're developing the Restoration Action Plan.

3 However, I will say that Fill Site 5 probably will
4 not have public access through it. The reason for that
5 is that Fill Site 5 was subject to the Endangered
6 Species Act called Consultation. Adjacent to the
7 habitat of two (INAUDIBLE) species, and in a way three,
8 because the third one is found across Lincoln and is
9 probably on the site. And as part of the process, we
10 had to consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service
11 under the Endangered Species Act. And we got a
12 biological opinion back from them that did have
13 conservation measures involved in that which actually we
14 had already discussed with them and we had agreed to.
15 It did include that where we could, we would restore.
16 That same habitat is very rare to this system, and that
17 would require that probably access be excluded. Not so
18 much fencing, though. I don't anticipate as much
19 fencing as just there wouldn't be any trails or anything
20 through them.

21 MR. COOPER: It's still visible. When you
22 walk on Washington Boulevard, you'll be able to see.

23 MS. THOMAS: It's visible from both ends.
24 It's visible from Lincoln and from Washington, from the
25 World War II memorial. Yeah. The area is visible. And

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 there will be trail access very close to the site, at
2 least in the initial things that I've seen regarding the
3 trails and bikeways plan. There's access fairly close
4 to this.

5 So in conclusion, the public review process for
6 restoration action plans is different than the
7 remediation program. We have a public meeting every
8 fall. So we have an annual meeting where the public can
9 provide comments on the -- present while we're doing the
10 (INAUDIBLE)comment. And then every spring we have a
11 brochure, an updated brochure. That brochure should
12 come out at the end of this month. Anna's working on it
13 right now. It will have a way to comment on the
14 programs, on the projects through Email, I think. And
15 so you will be able to get that and respond to that on
16 these remediation projects you saw here tonight. And
17 there will be a description of those sites, of Landfill
18 4 and Fill Site 5, in that brochure.

19 So that concludes my program tonight.

20 MR. ANDERSON: How do you define historic?
21 You talked about historic forest.

22 MS. THOMAS: Everything that I've heard about
23 defining history has come from the historians here in
24 the Presidio and the Park Service, so I'm not the expert
25 on that. However, the historic forest, right now, is

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 designated from the earliest photograph we have of the
2 forest, which is a 1935 photograph, because that's the
3 nearest as-built that we have of the forest. But the
4 forest historicity and significance comes from an 1890
5 plan by Major Jones where he specifically, in his design
6 for the forest, had some statements that were
7 represented in the historic landmark designation.
8 Things like crowning the ridges. Things like making the
9 power of the government seem greater than it is. There
10 are certain statements. All of the boundary trees.
11 Making it separate from the city through boundary trees.
12 There are certain kinds of design elements that he had
13 in there that create that historic significance of the
14 forest.

15 MR. COOPER: Are any trees native?

16 MS. THOMAS: The interesting thing is that
17 when the forest was designed, it was designed right
18 after Golden Gate Park. So Major Jones had a list of
19 all sorts of trees. But the success of the trees that
20 were planted at Golden Gate Park strongly influenced the
21 planting regime, so that they really planted the trees
22 that were doing well in Golden Gate Park. Those were
23 Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress and eucalyptus.
24 Although there were other trees planted -- there were
25 even some redwoods planted -- the majority of the forest

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 were those trees.

2 MR. ANDERSON: I forget who the designer of
3 Golden Gate Park was, but the history that I've heard
4 was that he planted eucalyptus as sort of soil holders
5 as he was building soil. And there was a great public
6 outcry against them. As soon as they sort of matured,
7 he started cutting them down and replacing them with
8 what he really wanted. And there was all sorts of
9 public outcry about losing these majestic trees. Seems
10 like other agencies are hot to get rid of their
11 eucalyptus in the state. I'm kind of surprised that you
12 don't intend to keep them or put more in.

13 MS. THOMAS: It is the definition. It is the
14 way that they've characterized the historic forest. And
15 so it's really determined by those experts for us.
16 However, they have given that leniency that they agree
17 that that particular eucalyptus, the Blue Gum
18 Eucalyptus, is not the best. And so they're looking at
19 a variety of eucalyptus trees.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Do these other eucalyptus
21 species look similar to the Blue Gum?

22 MS. THOMAS: Not exactly. They're shorter in
23 stature and they're a little less hazardous. So that's
24 probably going to be a question for the folks that are
25 defining that character for us, if it does well or not.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 And it's really defined by the study that's ongoing
2 right now. In about six or eight months we should have
3 the results of that study. It sounds like you might be
4 very interested.

5 MR. BERMAN: Are you constrained to use
6 eucalyptus regardless of the particular subspecies in
7 those areas?

8 MS. THOMAS: Not completely. The Vegetation
9 Management Plan allows for changes in species type as
10 long as they set this for a character of the site. So
11 if there is a species that has the same texture, the
12 same form, fits into the background the same, than
13 perhaps that can be a replacement species. But for
14 example, if you have a tree right outside the Golden
15 Gate Club, the Monterey Cypress that has this gorgeous
16 look to it and it has this design landscape, it would
17 probably have to be a Monterey Cypress. So it kind of
18 depends on the specific tree. If its individual look
19 like next to a building or next to a situation is strong
20 via having just as a background landscape. There's a
21 different type of species that can be used as background
22 landscape.

23 MR. O'HARA: Are any of the eucalyptus trees
24 in the southeast corner, the historic forest, the
25 southeast corner of the Presidio?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. THOMAS: Yes. Very historic.

2 MR. O'HARA: I understand that. My question
3 is, the species that you've referred to around Landfill
4 4, is this the same species that's up in the southeast
5 corner of the hills?

6 MS. THOMAS: Yes, it is. But it has a totally
7 different look.

8 MR. O'HARA: Are you planning to replace those
9 trees?

10 MS. THOMAS: The area that he's talking about
11 in the southeast corner is incredibly tall, gorgeous and
12 evenly-spaced. They look like a regiment of soldiers.
13 They're really tall. And those are actually one of
14 what's called a key historic stand. So there's a few
15 areas in the Presidio where they've identified stands of
16 trees in the historic forest that really are Presidio
17 forest trees, character trees. Those right now will be
18 replanted exactly the way they are, in the rows, by the
19 same species. But that particular stand is probably a
20 long ways down the road. And if there were other
21 species that were found to be compatible in that
22 situation, then the historians would have to decide how
23 they want to deal with that.

24 MR. O'HARA: That stand of trees has an
25 environment impact outside the Presidio. It provides a

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 wind break. And we would be looking for assurances that
2 any maneuvering of those trees or manipulation of those
3 trees would not in any way have an adverse effect on the
4 environment that they now protect.

5 MS. THOMAS: Actually, it's not just those
6 trees. The whole western bluff also provides a wind
7 break. In fact, that was one of the features that Major
8 Jones did was this was not just for aesthetics. This
9 was a functional forest. And there is a wind study
10 going on right now because even though it provides a
11 wind break, the forest is deteriorating. So the forest
12 is going to need to slowly be replaced just like in
13 Golden Gate Park. They're replacing their forest.
14 These trees just don't last forever. So we're going to
15 have to, through this wind study and through forest
16 planning, figure out a way that we can maintain that
17 function, maintain the values of the forest, and still
18 be able to reforest it, still be able to regenerate it
19 over time. And there's probably going to be a five-year
20 plan that will be put out in the next year or so, as far
21 as (INAUDIBLE) and how to implement restored
22 reforestation.

23 MS. CHEEVER: About Fill Site 5. I personally
24 like the fence really much because I really like the
25 Lobos Dunes area. I have come in contact with other San

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Franciscans who are concerned about the loss of Fill
2 Site 5 as recreation site. And I am wondering how to
3 respond to two specific questions. One is, is there any
4 part of what is now Fill Site 5, maybe near the road,
5 that is more accessible like places where there could be
6 a picnic table? And secondly, how inevitable was the
7 interactions with the Fish and Wildlife Service once the
8 decision was made to return to the native contours? Did
9 that in itself trigger the requirement that you had to
10 consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service, which in
11 turn triggered their opinion that you would (INAUDIBLE)?
12 But that's because the action of the remediated
13 landfills was being taken. That in itself inevitably
14 required you to consult with the Fish and Wildlife
15 service.

16 MS. THOMAS: In this particular case it is,
17 but through the Vegetation Management Plan, that site is
18 a natural area anyway. And that was part of the thought
19 is that in order for the Vegetation Management Plan,
20 which also needs to be reviewed by Fish and Wildlife
21 Service, that in order to make it as balanced as we
22 possibly could, making sure that we protect all of the
23 values in the mosaic here, that area was determined to
24 be -- its strongest value was endangered species. The
25 serpentine grassland is one of the rarest plant

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 community in the world. So that particular site is the
2 most sensitive site.

3 As far as recreation goes, some of the comments
4 that we could get on this plan when the vegetation
5 brochure comes out, you can make that comment into the
6 public record, and we will be able to consider it. What
7 we can do is call Fish and Wildlife Service and ask them
8 if they feel that there would be a detrimental effect if
9 this occurred.

10 In general, the Fish and Wildlife Service is
11 responsible for the endangered species. So we need to
12 work with them to make sure that what we're doing does
13 not impact endangered species.

14 MR. PONTON: Earlier you mentioned the
15 timeline, how it's important to get on track and keep on
16 track and it takes some time to plan. I was wondering
17 if you gain some type of efficiency, or given that there
18 is the natural area, I think there's a price on common
19 plants along that trend. Does the timeline compress
20 with time, that the more you work at this site and apply
21 it to the site --

22 MS. THOMAS: I would say the main way we would
23 compress the timeline is when we've done enough sites
24 that it becomes more comfortable, and when there is more
25 propagules. So the more native plants we restore, the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 more propagules we'll be able to collect, and the more
2 we'd be able to outplant. So in a way, the more
3 experience we have and the more we restore, the faster
4 (INAUDIBLE).

5 MR. PONTON: I think when you were in Power
6 Point, I remember if you hit Shift B you can do a blank
7 screen. If I remember from a few years ago, a Shift B
8 will blank out the screen.

9 MS. THOMAS: Thanks. I will definitely try to
10 figure that out.

11 MR. HERMANN: What was on 5 before it was just
12 leveled? I've only been in San Francisco for five
13 years. It's been level for five years. What kind of
14 recreation was going on there before it was leveled?

15 MR. FORD: At Fill Site 5 I think it was dunes
16 bumping up against serpentine grassland up until about
17 the mid- to late-'30s. The first evidence we have,
18 there are air photos in the late '30s that show the
19 ground kind of being scuffed up. And we can't tell
20 whether they were digging or filling.

21 MR. HERMANN: No, I'm sorry. My question is,
22 what kind of recreation was going on there 15 years ago?
23 People are objecting because they want recreation. Was
24 there picnic tables there 15 years ago?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: At the beginning of the '90s,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 which might be In that timeframe, it was generally a
2 dirt or loosely-graveled parking lot, not unlike what it
3 is today.

4 MR. HERMANN: So it's never been used for
5 recreation?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: When I first started in '95,
7 people would occasionally pull their cars off into that
8 area and eat their lunch in the car.

9 MR. HERMANN: That's all I've ever seen.

10 MR. FORD: We do have people who spin donuts
11 there.

12 MR. ANDERSON: I hate to beat a dead horse,
13 but eucalyptus have another (INAUDIBLE) environmental
14 effect, and that is that they are fairly heavy hitters
15 of hydrocarbons which contribute to the formation of
16 ozone and smog. The Bay Area Air Quality Management
17 District some years ago did a historical study that
18 showed that there's a strong correlation between the
19 growth of the eucalyptus in the Oakland hills with that
20 year's ozone maximum. And in particular, the year that
21 they all froze up, ozone was much improved, reduced.

22 MS. THOMAS: I have heard that.

23 MR. BERMAN: A comment taking after what Julie
24 said about Fill Site 5. To a certain extent, being just
25 near Lincoln and near the Memorial, it's an ideal place

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 to have some portion of it devoted to a walk-through or
2 some recreational area. It would seem to me that it
3 would be a shame to fence it off or exclude it from any
4 participation by the public. I know that there's an
5 endangered species there, but maybe a cleverly-designed
6 plan can satisfy both the need for preserving some of
7 the endangered species, and at the same time allow a
8 certain amount of public access. If you fence it off,
9 or close it off, it's almost as bad as fencing off a
10 landfill area. The fence maybe looks a little bit
11 better. But again, to deprive public access to an area
12 in a public park for an endangered species, a lot of
13 people might feel, "So what?" I think, to me, it would
14 be very important to find a balance between satisfying
15 the need to public access and at the same time
16 preserving some portions for endangered species. I
17 would personally encourage that you don't go all one way
18 on this, and that you look very hard to see if you could
19 allow a certain amount of public participation or
20 whatever that you (INAUDIBLE) in recreation in that
21 area. It's actually quite nice. It's a nice view from
22 there, and it's close to an area that people go to and
23 the Memorial. So I think that the park would be well
24 served not to completely segregate it as a place for
25 grasses to grow.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. THOMAS: Your comment's noted, but also I
2 am sure that before the second phase of revegetation
3 this Trails and Bikeways Plan will be out, and that's
4 going to have to go through consultation with Fish and
5 Wildlife Service probably again as well, although it's
6 kind-of gone through a preliminary. And that's a really
7 good time to also make sure that your needs are met
8 within that plan. I am pretty sure that it will go out
9 to the public prior to our second revegetation. So
10 there would still be some time if that were the case.

11 MR. O'HARA: I'd like to respond to Sam and
12 George. Do you have any idea -- we all know what the
13 landfill looks like now. But if you do excavate, do you
14 have any idea of what the difference in the terrain will
15 look like? Once you have finished excavating, it may
16 not have that desirability for recreation as we now see
17 it. Do you have any idea of what the topography will
18 look like?

19 MR. FORD: We have a general idea. It's going
20 to slope downwards towards the ocean, towards the west.
21 The fill is about 12 to 14 feet thick at the downhill
22 end of it, so the ground surface is going to drop 12 to
23 14 feet in the outer limits of the fill. I think it's
24 actually going to be a fairly gentle slope. I wouldn't
25 want to guess at the degrees of slope, but it isn't

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 going to be like a steep bluff. And I think I actually
2 do believe that there is going to be a bit of a bench
3 next to Washington boulevard. We will have to see after
4 we take the fill out what's left. But the impression I
5 have so far is that we will not be taking a lot of
6 material off close to Washington Boulevard. So there
7 may be a bit of a level spot adjacent to the street.

8 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

9 MR. COOPER: Just so our expectations are
10 right for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 implementation
11 strategy, what percent of Landfill 4 will be outplanted
12 this winter and what percent will be in geo cover? And
13 the same thing for Fill Site 5. What percent will be
14 outplanted and what percent will be in temporary cover?

15 MS. THOMAS: Landfill 4 will be completely
16 planted because we don't have the same issues with the
17 reforestation as we do with the natural area. And it
18 also will look like there's some trees. It will have
19 that kind of new reforestation look.

20 But Fill Site 5 is the one at issue because of the
21 issues there. It depends on how much is dune and how
22 much is serpentine. If more is dune, we can cover more.
23 We'll have more dune plants available. The serpentine
24 plants, I think we may have only a quarter of an acre.
25 Jen?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stabilized would be half an
2 acre. First year, only half an acre. But if it is more
3 dune, (INAUDIBLE) surplus species.

4 MR. COOPER: What's the total acreage of Fill
5 Site 5? 3.8?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: So it's about an eighth of a
7 site.

8 MS. THOMAS: And again, that's partially
9 because we've just been a little behind the ball on
10 this.

11 MR. FORD: I think 5, when we're finished
12 digging, it's going to come out about 2/3 dune and 1/3
13 serpentine based on projecting the bedrock and the
14 geology across the site.

15 MS. THOMAS: And that might be a little more
16 positive for us, because we actually grew some plants
17 for Disturbed Area 3 this year too, not knowing what was
18 going to be happening. So we might be able to use some
19 of the disturbed area tree plants if there is more dune.
20 Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Moving along. Topic
22 No. 5A. Overview of Remedial Action Plan for Landfill 4
23 and Fill Site 5. Craig Cooper of the Presidio Trust.
24 This is sort of more details than what was discussed at
25 the public meeting?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: We can make it whatever people
2 want. I have no interest in necessarily repeating it.
3 Maybe for RAB members that didn't make it to the public
4 meeting, did you get your Proposed Plan? Do you have
5 any questions we could answer here? I don't have a
6 presentation in place or in mind right now. I don't
7 want to bore the RAB members that did come to the public
8 meeting with a complete repeat of what was said earlier.
9 So but as a recap of the public meeting, I thought it
10 went well. I don't remember any negative comments
11 during the formal public comment period. Several
12 positive comments.

13 MS. YOUNG: Can we talk about the CEQA
14 extension a little bit? Can we get some more details on
15 that?

16 MR. COOPER: Okay. Yeah. When I sent the
17 first draft of the CEQA documents to Bob, we were kind
18 of juggling the need for starting the public comment
19 period and getting going versus having what another
20 agency called the State Clearing House giving us the
21 final green light that our CEQA documents were of
22 adequate quality. So Bob and I took a little risk here
23 to keep things going, and we decided to start the public
24 comment period. We did get some comments back on the
25 draft CEQA documents. We're in the process of fixing

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 them. They're not fundamental flaws. It's just a
2 matter of the Trust needed to do a little bit more
3 homework on traffic and noise and things like that and
4 make sure that we had our mitigation measures in place.
5 I just resubmitted that back to Bob today. Hopefully
6 we'll get a version that is acceptable to the State
7 Clearing House. And I guess rule is that once the
8 version is acceptable to the State Clearing House, then
9 they need those state agencies to look at it in 30 full
10 days. So we're at June 11. Let's say if it's June 15,
11 we get the final rewrite. That means 30 days after
12 that, the comment period would end then July 15th.
13 That's the story on that.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Craig, you might point out
15 also that during that 30 days that the State Clearing
16 House is reviewing it, there needs to be a public
17 meeting.

18 MR. COOPER: Right. So what we'll have to do
19 is the Trust will have to put a notice in the paper
20 saying that the public comment period is going to be
21 extended for whatever. We haven't figured out exactly
22 how many days, but it's going on the timeframe of about
23 two weeks. And that notice will go into the paper, and
24 then we'll have a public meeting, probably a very brief
25 public meeting. And the public notice will say,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 "Extension is until July 15th, (or whatever day we end
2 up on), and a public meeting will be held on July
3 whatever." If it's all right with the RAB, we're
4 thinking maybe July 9th. But that's up for you guys to
5 decide. It doesn't have to be July 9. We can pick
6 another date.

7 MR. BERMAN: So this is actually a second
8 public meeting that comes about because of the
9 requirements. If the documents had gone to the State
10 Clearing house a little bit earlier, then the meeting we
11 had tonight would have sufficed. But because of the
12 slippage there, the public meeting had to be essentially
13 repeated.

14 MR. COOPER: Right.

15 MR. PONTON: The whole public meeting, or just
16 the CEQA part? The whole public meeting?

17 MR. COOPER: Well, since the presentation is
18 already done -- I was just talking to Pat Wright, the
19 DTSC Community Involvement Coordinator, and she said
20 that it was probably okay to do the same presentation,
21 even shorten it up a little bit, and talk about maybe
22 what was changed in the CEQA document.

23 MR. BERMAN: It's only the CEQA issue, right?

24 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

25 MR. BOGGS: Well, actually it goes beyond

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 that, because some people through the public
2 notification process -- it hasn't gone to some people
3 that should have gotten it yet through the CEQA process,
4 through the Clearing House. And so there's public
5 access through that. Those members of the public don't
6 even know that this meeting happened yet. Once the
7 Clearing House lets it out, those people have to be
8 given the opportunity to make oral comments. It's just
9 making sure everybody has the opportunity to comment.
10 Even though the only changes are to the CEQA stuff, not
11 everybody has been told they have a chance to comment
12 orally. And that won't happen until the CEQA document
13 goes out.

14 MR. PONTON: Didn't you refer to a process
15 tonight where you said you couldn't answer questions
16 beyond a certain point?

17 MR. COOPER: At that meeting. Just for the
18 second half of the meeting I can't answer them.

19 MR. PONTON: But tomorrow you --

20 MR. COOPER: I can answer questions again.

21 MR. PONTON: And you go through that whole
22 process again?

23 MR. COOPER: Yes. The format of the meeting
24 will be just like the meeting that we had earlier
25 tonight.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. PONTON: How long do you think it's going
2 to take you to respond to comments and to finalize the
3 RAP?

4 MR. COOPER: Well, positive comments, we just
5 basically in the Response to Comments section, we write
6 out the comment, and then we just say, "Comment noted,"
7 or "Thank you for your comment" if it's in support of
8 choosing Alternative Four. So I haven't received any
9 other comments at this point in time, so so far the
10 Response to Comments document is going to be very easy
11 to write.

12 MR. BERMAN: Except for these people who have
13 been waiting in the wings for their notification about
14 CEQA, that they could come with a comment that you'd
15 have to answer. And if that was on July 9th, you would
16 have to hustle in order to get your revised RAP out by
17 then, by the end of the public comment period, right?

18 MR. COOPER: No. We don't have to get the
19 final RAP out by the end of the public comment period.
20 We can start working on it. If we wait until July 15th,
21 or whatever the comment period is, you can still get a
22 comment on the last day by E-mail or by regular mail.
23 And then you finish your responsive comments. We can
24 start working on the response to comments. But as
25 comments come in, you add that to your working document

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and start working on finalizing the RAP to some degree
2 also. But we can't finish it up until the comment
3 period is done.

4 MR. PONTON: There's a good chance this won't
5 go before our Board in July. Our Board meeting is
6 July 17th. So it's not going to make it.

7 MR. COOPER: You feel like it's too close?

8 MR. BOGGS: If you'll be able to complete the
9 response to comments that we can draft and approve prior
10 to -- i.e. you need to get the final RAP; we need to
11 re-review it and bless it before it goes to his Board.

12 MR. COOPER: Okay.

13 MR. PONTON: I can't see --

14 MR. FORD: It sounds like it's August.

15 MR. COOPER: Yeah. Sorry about that. Is it
16 too late to move it to August?

17 MR. PONTON: No. Notification -- the EOI item
18 that was submitted was describing that it would happen
19 next month, so it's not late to move it. It just may
20 cause some confusion. We can straighten it out.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Maybe there's some ways to,
22 particularly with the types of comments we had tonight,
23 to forecast those comments to the Board and suggest that
24 pending, you know, unresolvable comments, and if none of
25 those unresolvable comments come forth, the Board would

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 conditionally approve it. They could do that in July.

2 MR. PONTON: I don't know. I don't know if
3 that's the approach they would take. I think the Board
4 would like to see that the lead agency is satisfied and
5 would sign off on that. I don't think we'd be the first
6 to sign. I don't know. I'm speculating. I would feel
7 more comfortable that it meets the requirements of the
8 DTSC. It's their document.

9 MR. COOPER: Okay. So we might have two more
10 documents for August.

11 MR. BOGGS: I would tend to say I'm not going
12 to get anybody's signature in two days.

13 MR. FORD: In two days after the close of the
14 comment period.

15 MR. BOGGS: We're hoping that -- we're still
16 got a few hurdles to have it actually close on the 15th.
17 There's a good chance it would close on the 17th. Then
18 we're cutting it close.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: What are the rules about the
20 decisions and the bidding? Because if you really want
21 to mobilize in October, we have to get on the street
22 now.

23 MR. FORD: The bidding is going on a parallel
24 track. We have a Draft Work Plan which is actually
25 another document we have to submit to DTSC. We're

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 finishing that up right now, and we'll send the draft to
2 DTSC so they can look it over. We're also putting
3 together our procurement. I'm sending plans and specs
4 to our Procurement Department within about the next ten
5 days. Then we'll put in a CBD. We're going to have a
6 schedule. We'll put in a CBD announcement which I think
7 will come out in July and a bid period which will
8 essentially be the month of August. We'll make an award
9 around the end of August or the first of September. And
10 then the month of September we'll be getting permits in
11 place and getting contractor's work plans approved. The
12 contracting is going on a parallel track. I've learned
13 a little bit about federal procurement. Nothing
14 happens quite as fast as we'd like, but we have enough
15 time to get all the ducks lined up on this one.

16 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other questions on Landfill
17 4 and Fill Site 5? Further discussion on CEQA?

18 Let's move on to 5A, No. 3. Discussion of RAB
19 letter (INAUDIBLE) Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. Julie?

20 MS. CHEEVER: I am the messenger, not the
21 creator, of the letter. The letter, which I have right
22 here and I will pass around, represents the thoughts of
23 at least half a dozen RAB members right now. More
24 thoughts are welcome. In fact, I have some from Sam
25 that I didn't get in time to put into this. By the way,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Mark, do you think we can give drafts to the audience?

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: If they're some left over,
3 yeah.

4 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah. There's plenty. I urge
5 audience members to keep in mind that this is just a
6 draft, not the final thing. It may not even come to
7 fruition.

8 At any rate, this is definitely in keeping with
9 some previous letters that we've written both this year
10 and in past years, and discussions we've had at our
11 planning committee. And I guess everyone's looking at
12 it.

13 The first paragraph kind of emphasizes that we've
14 been watching over this process for a long time, and
15 we're very glad that's something is finally happening;
16 in general, that something being that the four
17 alternatives are being presented. The next paragraph
18 says that we endorse the preferred alternative and why.
19 Something that has been discussed a lot, the advantage
20 of permanently removing the contamination, avoiding
21 future maintenance and monitoring cost. And also
22 including recycling as part of the plan. That's
23 something that RAB has been talking about for a long
24 time.

25 Finally, one more sentence I guess returning to the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 theme we'd had for many years. We're glad that things
2 are going to move ahead now.

3 I know Sam at least had some suggestions, so if Sam
4 you could say what your suggestions are in about a
5 minute two after giving them a chance to read it. I
6 think if we agree on suggestions by consensus we can do
7 that. If it looks like there is disagreement, we can
8 consider an amendment and have a vote on it. Does that
9 sound all right procedurally? Anybody else need a copy?
10 Does everybody have one?

11 MR. BERMAN: I don't have anything really
12 substantial in modifying the principles that Julie laid
13 out. I just wanted to make the letter a little bit
14 tighter in the words, and in a few cases, clear as to
15 what was being referred to. My changes, if I could
16 really suggest it, I can just tell you what I have done
17 here.

18 In the first paragraph it says, "Community Members
19 of the Rab welcomes this opportunity." Well, we haven't
20 been invited. So I thought that word welcome was really
21 out of place. I thought, "The RAB wishes to take this
22 opportunity." So that's the kind of thing I was
23 thinking of.

24 And the last sentence of the first paragraph, I've
25 rewritten it. It says, "We commend the efforts of the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Presidio Trust and the National Park Service and
2 regulatory agencies (I've added this) and hope that they
3 will all move forward in a timely manner with an
4 effective cleanup at these sites."

5 MS. CHEEVER: Sam, one paragraph at a time.
6 You mentioned two changes in that paragraph. So any
7 discussion of those changes? Everybody happy with
8 Sam's changes?

9 MR. ANDERSON: I would prefer the way it is.
10 I guess we have been offered an opportunity --

11 MR. O'HARA: My sense is we could spend the
12 next five hours wordsmithing this thing. It's not in
13 its final form tonight. Why don't you go back and
14 wordsmith the thing on the computers and come out with
15 something that everybody agrees on. It's a waste of
16 time to go through this thing tonight wordsmithing.
17 It's crazy.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Well, we actually maybe have
19 more time. Should we put it off?

20 MR. O'HARA: Yeah. Let's get it into final
21 form on E-Mail and then --

22 MR. BERMAN: I'm only offering these as
23 suggestions.

24 MR. O'HARA: I understand that, Sam.

25 MR. BERMAN: Whoever is mastering this thing

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 can take these suggestions and use them or toss them. I
2 just gave the background for why I thought that the
3 letter could be made a little bit tighter.

4 MS. YOUNG: We only have one more RAB meeting
5 within the comment period.

6 MS. CHEEVER: Why don't we talk about it at
7 our committee meeting? Because when we talked about it
8 before at our mini-meeting at the coffee house -- which
9 everyone was invited to and actually was very productive
10 working together -- so why don't we encourage -- I think
11 that would be a good thing to have on our committee
12 meeting agenda two weeks from now.

13 MR. HERMANN: If we have another coffee
14 meeting, is it possible to give the date to me? I read
15 my E-mail after you guys had the meeting. Otherwise I
16 would have been there.

17 MS. CHEEVER: It was kind of a last-minute
18 thing, but we wanted to figure out what our input would
19 be in the public meeting just now. And we needed a few
20 days big time to do whatever input we did. So that was
21 an unusual circumstance for that. And also we want to
22 find a place that has better parking as well as public
23 transit access. It can be a challenge, but we'll work
24 on that too.

25 MS. YAROS: I circled the block three times.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. HERMANN: Where did you guys go? Oh, the
2 one on the 25th? If you go to Royal Grind on 17th,
3 you're right there by a public parking lot. 17th and
4 Geary. There's a public parking lot off of 18th.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. So is it agreeable that
6 we postpone the deliberation of this letter to the next
7 RAB meeting?

8 MS. WRIGHT: And the extension is for sure,
9 right? If that's the case --

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Item 6. Regulatory Agency
11 Status Updates/Inputs. Bob is not here. Anything you
12 want to talk to us about, Jim? A status update or a
13 report?

14 MR. PONTON: I reviewed the Commissary's
15 Investigation Report, and I submitted those comments to
16 Craig and Jennifer today. We'll be meeting to talk
17 about that work plan with Brian and the Trust and their
18 consultant.

19 And I guess the next time (INAUDIBLE) is the
20 RAWP -- Remedial Action Work Plan. I wanted to ask the
21 RAB -- I understand that you all talked about it at the
22 last committee meeting. I was wondering what your
23 general feelings are about it?

24 Lastly, there is a person here from Channel 3 news
25 who is doing a story on ghost sighting at the Presidio.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 A clairvoyant is here and she's set up outside. And she
2 wanted to know if she could talk to anybody here about
3 strange happenings.

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: If there was anybody in here
5 with us at the last RAB meeting --

6 MR. COOPER: Did you notice these doors
7 opening and closing at the last RAB meeting?

8 MR. PONTON: I said that we'd be finishing
9 soon and we'd all be walking out that door.

10 MS. YAROS: She sees these visions and they're
11 real, right?

12 MR. PONTON: Yeah. Other than that, there are
13 no other updates.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Bob, do you have anything to
15 report to us?

16 MR. BOGGS: No. I think most things have been
17 dovered. If there's any questions, I can answer them.
18 I've been jumping through hoops and working hard trying
19 to get to these things like this last CEQA document. I
20 got E-mail from Craig at 8:11 last night. There has
21 been a lot of effort put in on both sides. I think
22 we're seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. Kudos
23 to everyone.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Are all these delays which in
25 turn trigger other problems like meetings being held

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 later, are they jeopardizing the schedule of getting the
2 remediation underway before the rainy season? Or are
3 you still within some margins that you have built in?

4 MR. COOPER: This shouldn't hurt us. What
5 could cause a delay is the approval -- I think we have
6 enough wiggle room with getting the final RAP signed.
7 If Jim wants to wait until August, that's okay. We
8 still have September to get the Work Plan approved and
9 do the procurement. Those are the two things -- now, if
10 those two things slip, that could be trouble.

11 MR. SUTTER: That's pretty tight.

12 MR. COOPER: It is tight. Trying to do
13 everything all in one year is a very unique and
14 ambitious thing to do, to write the RAP, have the public
15 comment period, write a RAP in final, get Agency
16 approval, do the remedial design work plan, procurement
17 and cleanup all in one year. It's happened, but it's
18 extremely unusual. Everything has to happen in place,
19 and it takes a lot of risk-taking not only on the
20 Presidio Trust to do things concurrently, but also a lot
21 of cooperation with the regulatory agencies. So far so
22 good. But we're not out of the woods yet.

23 MR. O'HARA: Question for George. Once you
24 get the green light, what is your theoretical program
25 time from the day you start until the day you finish?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 What do you anticipate?

2 MR. FORD: There will be heavy digging and
3 hauling for roughly six to eight weeks. So if we can
4 start around October 1st, we should be done towards the
5 end of November. There may be some little odds and ends
6 that we're doing after that, but the main work will be
7 done during October and say the first three weeks of
8 November.

9 MR. O'HARA: If you get early rains, how does
10 that set you back?

11 MR. FORD: Assuming we don't have a monsoon
12 that comes in in November, it would just be sort of a
13 day-for-day delay. We're going to have erosion control
14 measures and everything in place so that we don't have
15 any disasters that we have to clean up. And then it's
16 just a matter if it rains, we'd have to wait until it's
17 dry enough for the equipment to move around. The good
18 news on that front is that the sites are sandy and drain
19 quickly. And a lot of the fill that's placed on there
20 is fairly sandy, and I think can be expected to drain
21 pretty quickly.

22 MR. O'HARA: The serpentinite, though, is a
23 little bit difficult to deal with in the rain, isn't it?

24 MR. FORD: Yeah, it is. The good thing about
25 that, though, is that the serpentinite is down at the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 bottom of the pile. So we may have issues when we get
2 down there, but the majority of the fill was brought in
3 from someplace else. It's not serpentine fill. I am
4 hoping that dealing with the serpentinite and its
5 particular quirks will really be sort of a last thing
6 that we do on 1/3 of Fill Site 5.

7 MR. SUTTER: George, on the contracting
8 procurement cycle, it sounds like you may have only a
9 month to go through your bidding process to award a
10 contract.

11 MR. FORD: No, I've got more than a month.
12 This is one of the things where Craig was saying we'll
13 have to take some risks. We will have to put our bid
14 package out on the street roughly around the first of
15 August. If we change the work plan, or if the RAP, some
16 details of the remedy are changed, I will probably just
17 have to amend that bid package, I hope, during the
18 bidding period. If the changes come later, I'll have to
19 change order it after it's been awarded. We are going
20 to set it up so that the contractor understands that the
21 note -- he won't be entirely in charge of causing the
22 Notice to Proceed to be issued. He'll have his
23 submittals that he's got to do and get them approved,
24 but they will still be waiting to hear from Bob and Jim.
25 And the Notice to Proceed is not going to come out until

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 we've gotten approval of the RAP and the Work Plan.

2 MR. SUTTER: (INAUDIBLE) Planning committee
3 meeting getting a bid package out on the street early
4 even if you had to issue (INAUDIBLE).

5 MR. FORD: We have to. If we didn't put it
6 out to bid until the RAP was approved, we'd be talking
7 about digging it in January or February or March because
8 it does -- it takes more than a month for us to really
9 make an award and get everything lined up.

10 MR. SUTTER: Thank you.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Takes us to New Business. We
12 have a list of recently released documents here. Look
13 through those.

14 No. 8 Review of Action items. I have: Discuss
15 the RAB letter at the next Planning Committee Meeting
16 and next RAB meeting. Any other action items that
17 anyone can think of?

18 MR. BERMAN: Jim asked for a little discussion
19 about what happened at the planning meeting and a
20 response to the RAWP.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Mostly we had a presentation by
22 Craig on the RAWP, and there was some discussion after
23 that.

24 MR. BERMAN: My personal response was I
25 thought it was very good. I think that the level of

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 technical detail and the planning, if they move it on
2 schedule, looked very good. There was nothing that I
3 remembered in a discussion that we had there at the
4 meeting of any substantial concern about it. So it was
5 generally well-liked.

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: It doesn't seem to be very
7 controversial among the RAB members. We generally think
8 it's a good idea, I believe.

9 MR. PONTON: So the public will probably
10 respond as favorably and people will accept it? Good.
11 Thanks.

12 MR. COOPER: And it is item No. 4 in the
13 released document. So the current draft of that
14 document is at the Trust library. We're still
15 collecting comments from the state agencies on this
16 particular draft. So the next draft might be the
17 official public comment version draft. Stay tuned for
18 that.

19 A proposed plan will come out on that and another
20 public meeting that might occur in July.

21 MS. WRIGHT: Can we combine them?

22 MR. COOPER: I don't think we could combine
23 the public meetings, but we could have them back to back
24 I think. I would have to talk to Pat Ryan about that.
25 We could have them back to back on the same day. We

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 were thinking if things work out well for the second
2 Landfill 4 public meeting, we're thinking about July 9.
3 We'd like to get your feedback on that. But for the
4 Contingency Action Plan, RAWP as we're calling it, we
5 were thinking of July 23, which is the night of your
6 committee meeting. We thought because you'd like to
7 come to the meetings, you could have it on the same
8 night as your meeting.

9 MS. CHEEVER: I think that makes sense.

10 MR. COOPER: Okay.

11 MR. BERMAN: One of the plans in all this
12 stuff that has to be done, and that's the Transportation
13 Plan. Presumably, that doesn't need a public hearing,
14 but it might be interesting on action items for our
15 comments on that maybe at a committee meeting, planning
16 committee meeting, that is.

17 MR. COOPER: (INAUDIBLE) on the Transportation
18 Plan?

19 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Just a comment on it.

20 MR. FORD: I think what we should do is we
21 could give you a short presentation on the Work Plan,
22 which doesn't include the Transportation Plan within it,
23 but it does list the restriction. Basically the
24 contractor is going to write the final Transportation
25 Plan. But the Work Plan that we're putting out kind of

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 lays out all of the restrictions and the requirements
2 that the contractor's plan is going to have to meet. So
3 we could bring that and sort of go through it.

4 MR. BERMAN: It's only a suggestion. I don't
5 know whether this is getting into minutia that's not
6 necessary.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think if you were to review
8 the whole Work Plan, that could be a way for people to
9 focus on that. It would give an idea of what the
10 general sorts of things in the Work Plan are, and it
11 might help some of the RAB members understand and
12 provide comment on that. That would be an efficient way
13 to do it, as opposed to everyone having to read the
14 whole document.

15 MR. FORD: Do you want to do that at the next
16 one? The Work Plan is still vibrating a little bit.
17 There are small changes, but I think the big pieces are
18 not going to change.

19 MS. YOUNG: Any agenda items for this RAB
20 meeting on July 11? Anything else? Any further
21 comments, discussion topics? Any new business? We've
22 got a get-well card for Doug Kern. Meeting adjourned.
23 Thank you.

24 (The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.)

25 ---oOo---

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 RAB MEMBERS

11 Jerry Anderson

12 Sam Berman

13 Bob Boggs, DTSC

14 Edward Callahan

15 Julie Cheever

16 Craig Cooper

17 George Ford, Presidio Trust

18 Joel Hermann

19 Jan Monaghan

20 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

21 Peter O'Hara

22 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board

23 David Sutter

24 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

25 Gloria Yaros

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Mark Youngkin

2

3 Others Present:

4 Terri Thomas, Presidio Trust

5 ----oOo----

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

THE OFFICER'S CLUB

BUILDING 50

JULY 9, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the monthly meeting
2 of the Presidio of San Francisco Restoration and
3 Advisory Board. My name is Mark Youngkin. I'm the
4 acting facilitator and community co-chair.

5 Doug Kern is recuperating at his parent's house in
6 Santa Clara. He's doing well. He's off the pain
7 medication and starting to walk around and actually
8 thinks he'll be back by September to facilitate the
9 meeting. We look forward to having our facilitator
10 back.

11 Anybody new here that should introduce themselves?
12 Everybody looks familiar.

13 Does everybody have a copy of the agenda? Are
14 there any modifications that anybody would like to
15 propose?

16 MR. NELSON: Items A and C will be blended
17 together, and George Ford will talk about Landfill 4 and
18 5, and then you can do your vote and then we'll get on
19 to the project.

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: So there's a proposal to move
21 Item C up and combine it with A?

22 MR. NELSON: Right. But not to interrupt the
23 vote, if you prefer.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: Let's wait as long as possible
25 to see if we have a quorum. I was going to add our

1 membership committee report to No. 4, Committee Business
2 and Reports.

3 Under Announcements and Old Business C, I was going
4 to talk about a letter I received from Craig Middleton.
5 So any objections to that? Let's proceed.

6 Announcements and Old Business. A and B were just
7 announcements of a public meeting and comment period.
8 You guys have dates on those, right? The Public Comment
9 Period will be on what date?

10 MR. COOPER: It's in my presentation, but for
11 Landfill 4, the second public meeting is going to be
12 July 16, and for the plug-in ROD, it's in my
13 presentation.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Item C. I received a response
15 letter to our letter. You may remember on May 14th,
16 community members voted and passed the letter to Craig
17 Middleton. The subject was urgent need for action at
18 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. I have a response here from
19 Craig Middleton. I'd like to pass that around for
20 community members to read.

21 Any more announcements and old business? Seeing
22 none, let's move on to Committee Business and Reports.
23 Planning Committee report. Tracy Wright has agreed to
24 do it this month.

25 MS. WRIGHT: We had a meeting on Tuesday

1 June 25th starting with a vibrant discussion on Landfill
2 4/Fill Site 5 status. We talked about how the public
3 comments are going. I want to encourage letters to come
4 in. I think at that point there was only one negative
5 comment. That was good.

6 We talked a little bit about the plan for the
7 actual Work Plan. It looks like it's taking place in
8 October. Then we pulled out all sorts of great maps and
9 asked George a lot of questions. One of the things that
10 came up was the 2600 truckloads, I think averaging about
11 250 a day. And so we talked about how they're going to
12 enter and exit Doyle Drive, and what kind of impact that
13 might have on our quality of life. That's about it for
14 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.

15 We also had a quick discussion about CPN
16 scheduling. It sounds like the Trust is going to hire
17 someone to do the scheduling. We also discussed the RAB
18 support letter that we'll be voting on tonight. We do
19 have several proxy votes.

20 And also that night our membership received a
21 letter of resignation from Willard Harris. We discussed
22 her participation. She had decided that she needed to
23 resign based on having conflicts on this evening. So we
24 all decided, "Let's call her and tell her that she can
25 miss a few meetings." So I called her, but she still

1 thinks she doesn't have the time to participate. So we
2 thanked her for her participation. I guess we'll
3 discuss sending her a letter of thanks. She's enjoyed
4 her time here. It sounds like Mark had mentioned that
5 typically it's supposed to be 20 and 30 members, and
6 right now we're at about 16. So we're hoping to attract
7 new members. The next committee meeting will be
8 July 23rd.

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Tracy. Any more
10 discussion on Announcements and Committee Business and
11 Reports? Any questions?

12 Seeing none, let's move on to Topic 5, Reports and
13 Discussions. Our Topic A combined with C, Project
14 Status Update. Craig Cooper.

15 MR. COOPER: Tracy, in response to a couple of
16 things that you brought up about the Committee Report,
17 one thing was about the amount of truck traffic and
18 impacts the trucks will have on that. The CEQA
19 documents, California Environmental Quality Act, those
20 documents analyze several categories of potential
21 impacts to the environment. Traffic and transportation
22 is one and air quality is another. So if you want to
23 see a detailed analysis of the way the Trust and DTSC
24 analyzes those things, check out the initial study at
25 the Trust library. I've been told by George Ford,

1 somebody brought up the idea of using natural gas
2 trucks. We actually looked into it, and we found out
3 that there is a few that do exist, but there's not a big
4 fleet. No one -- at least from our research -- no one
5 had a big fleet to handle the amount of trucks that
6 we're going to have going. Hopefully, as our work
7 proceeds, maybe some contractor down the road will have
8 some trucks to handle the size of the projects that
9 we're dealing with.

10 One other thing on Critical Path Method scheduling
11 is that the Trust is hiring a professional scheduler.
12 We actually used major portions from David Suider's
13 statement of work that he sent us, and we incorporated
14 that into our own statement of work. And we're putting
15 it out to a couple of contractors to hire professionals.

16 Let's talk about this. My presentation is going to
17 cover a variety of projects at the Presidio. First up
18 is Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. As I mentioned earlier,
19 the Comment Period has been extended to July 24. We
20 will have a second public meeting July 26, right here in
21 this room, from 6:00 to 7:00. Did I say 26th?
22 July 16th from 6:00 to 7:00. And it's a public meeting,
23 so everyone's welcome. It's basically going be a repeat
24 of the public meeting that occurred on June 11. So I
25 guess if you enjoyed my presentation on June 11, you're

1 welcome to come back and hear it again. There isn't any
2 new information that's going to be presented. Bob and I
3 explained before, the reason for the extension of the
4 Public Comment Period and the second public meeting was
5 more of a timing issue with the State Clearing House --
6 the state agencies that received the document -- that
7 the CEQA documents were changed slightly. And so we
8 basically had to start the Public Comment Period again.

9 But the remedies are the same; everything is the
10 same. I tried to time it to have this meeting with a
11 RAB meeting, but we couldn't work it out. I apologize
12 that in July there are remediation meetings this month.
13 If RAB members don't come on July 16th, that's
14 understood. That's fine. So that's what I have to say
15 on that.

16 As you probably talked about at the last Committee
17 meeting, George Ford has been working with the Trust
18 contracting people to set up our bids and to get that
19 going. And we think that we're still on schedule to
20 start the actual excavation and cleanup work in October.
21 And as Mark said, we wrote the RAB a letter back
22 concerning our joint interest in having these two sites
23 cleaned up this year.

24 So Mark, did you want to stop here and talk about
25 Landfill 4? Just keep going through? Okay.

1 So the other thing, as we've talked about in a
2 couple of previous meeting, the next CERCLA-style
3 decision document that is coming out of the chutes is
4 what is called the base-wide Remedial Action Work Plan
5 for contingency sites. We've talked about contingency
6 sites, what unexpected or unknown contamination that we
7 discover. We're working on all the documents for that.

8 The decision document is this ROD document, but we
9 have to do the CEQA documents for that and a proposed
10 plan fact sheet and an administrative record. That's
11 all the documents that support our decision. So we're
12 compiling all these documents. We've gotten some
13 comments from Brian and the regulators for pulling
14 things together.

15 What we're shooting for -- I need to check this
16 with Bob and the Clearing House folks -- but we're
17 hoping to get the comment period started by about
18 July 24th, a 30-day comment period. So we have July 24
19 through August 22nd, that's 30 days. And a public
20 meeting would then happen on August 13, which is the
21 same date as the August RAP meeting from 6:00 to 7:30.
22 All right. Any questions on that?

23 MR. O'HARA: Mark, is this something that we
24 would dovetail a RAB meeting behind this Public Comment
25 Period, so we would start the meeting a half an hour

1 later?

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: We can do it that way, or we
3 can have a shorter meeting. We went from 6:00 to 7:30
4 last time.

5 MR. COOPER: We could, if Bob's okay with
6 making it an hour public meeting, we could do that.
7 There hasn't been any official public notices, so we can
8 set up a time as we see fit.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: I think an hour's enough.

10 MR. O'HARA: Do you have any kind of lead or
11 prospective as to how many people will be attending a
12 public meeting? Is there any sense that you get that
13 this would be an hour's worth of time or an hour and a
14 half? It really doesn't make any difference to me. Our
15 meeting is 7:00 or 7:30. I'd rather start it at 7:00,
16 if that's the consensus, but only if it makes sense to
17 shorten up the public comment.

18 MR. COOPER: On the June 11th public comment
19 meeting, we intentionally started about 6:15, and I went
20 through my presentation. There was some comments. I
21 think we ended up finishing around 7:15 and got the RAB
22 meeting started around 7:30. But we were taking our
23 time. Even if we say from 6:00 to 7:00, if there is a
24 lot of people that show up, everybody who wants to speak
25 gets a chance to speak. We don't stop them in

1 mid-sentence. I was thinking having it go to 7:30
2 would allow RAB members who really wanted to show up at
3 7:00 and not 6:00 to still have an opportunity to
4 comment during the formal Public Comment Period. They
5 would have an opportunity to do that.

6 MR. BOGGS: I think it would be good to keep
7 it at an hour and a half. This next one, I think there
8 will be more questions to explain and understand it.
9 Whereas 4 and 5, you have clean closure, so there's not
10 a lot of controversy or concerns. Whereas I think with
11 the contingency, there is going to be some items that
12 need some discussion just for people to understand what
13 we're trying to do.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: That replaces an agenda item in
15 a way?

16 MR. COOPER: Exactly. We were able to finish
17 the RAB meeting at a fairly reasonable hour even though
18 we had a 7:30 start time. Okay. So stay tuned on that.
19 Those are just tentative dates. When the proposed plan
20 fact sheet goes out, that will announce the official
21 comment period timeframe and the official meeting date.

22 Okay. Now a bit on a couple of other CERCLA sites
23 and move on to some petroleum sites and lead-based
24 paint, and so on.

25 Landfill E. We haven't forgotten about it.

1 Remember late last year into early this year, we all met
2 several times on thinking through an appropriate
3 investigation strategy to tie up some loose ends so we
4 can finish the Feasibility Study for Landfill E. The
5 Trust contractor is now working on that, and the work
6 plan is in preparation. It's been sent in to the Trust
7 one time. We commented on it and sent it back to the
8 contractor. We hope that the next round will be a
9 version that we'll release to Bob and Jim and the RAB
10 members. So I can't put an exact date on that at this
11 point, but there's been a flurry of activity in the last
12 couple of weeks on that particular work plan.

13 The other one that I want to mention is our
14 Investigation Work Plan at Landfill 8 and Landfill 10
15 which is over by the Public Health Service Hospital.
16 That Work Plan is at the Trust library, if you'd like to
17 take a look at it, and it's undergoing regulatory review
18 right now.

19 How about our next CERCLA Decision Document? Our
20 next CERCLA Decision Document is going to be covering
21 three CERCLA sites: Baker Beach 3 and 4 and Fill Site
22 6. The Trust and the National Park Service have
23 already reviewed one version of the Draft RAP for those
24 sites and commented on it, and sent it back to our
25 contractor. We hope the next version would be in good

1 enough shape to release to the regulators and the RAB.

2 So that one is moving along.

3 Just as we've begun doing with Landfill 4 and Fill
4 Site 5, we're doing a dual tract working on the CERCLA
5 Decision Document and the design at the same time, let's
6 say basically a year of the CERCLA process, if you do
7 that. And so our contractor is working on the remedial
8 design for those sites which right now are excavation
9 projects for the most part. So stay tuned for that.
10 After we get through the contingency ROD CERCLA decision
11 document, this will be the next one out. I expect this
12 winter timeframe Public Comment Period. I don't know
13 the exact schedule for it, but kind of ballpark it at
14 that timeframe.

15 Just as a heads up, as you know, we finished all of
16 our investigations at the LAIR project. As you can tell
17 if you've been over there, the demolition work is
18 completely done now. SO now we at the Trust are putting
19 together a report summarizing all of the sampling that
20 we undertook. And I'm going to put that together in
21 what we call a Closure Report and send that out to the
22 regulators for them to take a look at.

23 MR. BERMAN: Two questions on the Baker Beach
24 and Fill Site 6. We had recommended excavation on all
25 of those. Is that the intent now of the --

1 MR. COOPER: The direction we're heading for
2 Baker Beach 3 and 4 is full excavation of those entire
3 sites. And then for Fill Site 6, if you remember, it's
4 drawn as an extremely large, unwieldily area. And the
5 direction the Trust is heading right now is excavating
6 the mound between Gerard and Halleck in the Tennessee
7 Hollow riparian area. That's where the PCB contaminants
8 are also located. SO that area would be excavated out.
9 That's the direction we're going.

10 And then for the rest of Fill Site 6, the direction
11 we're going is that, because it's basically
12 institutional controls for any debris within the rest of
13 the fill site. So stay tuned for details on that.

14 MR. BERMAN: It's just that you would sort of
15 do some realtime sampling, so to speak, when you take
16 out the mound, just to see what's in the periphery
17 there. That's all going to be judgment that you're
18 going to do it sort of in realtime, not meant for
19 advanced planning.

20 MR. COOPER: Correct. For digging out the
21 mounted area, you mean like how far? It's fairly well
22 defined. We'll have to do confirmation soil sampling
23 just like at Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5; send out a grid
24 and make sure that we meet our cleanup levels for the
25 area we excavate.

1 MR. BERMAN: Right. But so far in 6, it's
2 mostly organics, right?

3 MR. COOPER: PCBs --

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: That one area, PCBs is the
5 driver. If you were out there during the trenching at
6 the area, it looked pretty good during the trenching,
7 but it turned out to be contaminated. The areas that
8 didn't look as good weren't contaminated. It's the way
9 it works sometimes, I guess.

10 MR. BOGGS: Soil (INAUDIBLE) is just picking
11 up with their bare hands and saying, "Oh, this would be
12 good (INAUDIBLE) soil."

13 MR. BERMAN: What I found is the problem with
14 Landfill E -- there is some activity over there now. Is
15 the contractor that's preparing the Work Plan, is that
16 the contractor that's over there and doing that?

17 MR. NELSON: There was a huge collapse in the
18 storm drain. The Trust crew is working on it now, and
19 they're trying to repair the storm drain.

20 MR. COOPER: But that isn't remediation work.

21 MR. BERMAN: Right. That's just some
22 emergency work that's going on there, basically.

23 MR. NELSON: It's valuable for us to be able
24 to look in all of those, a sneak peak at what we're
25 going to be seeing more in the trenches in the future.

1 MR. COOPER: So we got an advance --

2 MR. BERMAN: So actually some samples were
3 taken?

4 MR. NELSON: No. Just visual observation and
5 a trench log and stuff like that.

6 MR. BERMAN: The fenced area at the north end
7 of E is still being used as a police dog training area?

8 MR. NELSON: As far as I know, yes.

9 MR. BERMAN: It's always kind of a puzzle.
10 It's a huge site with probably a lot of toxic material
11 in it, but it's okay to train police dogs there. It's
12 been used as a baseball field for the last 25 years.

13 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

14 MR. BERMAN: It's a comment, not a question.

15 MR. NELSON: I'm not sure who made the
16 decision to discontinue the use. Was it the Army or the
17 Park Service?

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: (INAUDIBLE)

19 MR. NELSON: We've gone out and done screening
20 of the site of the ambient air above the ballfield to
21 check to see if there is any gas, and we haven't found
22 anything. As far as its intermittent use for dog
23 training and dog walking, it appears that it's probably
24 pretty safe. The bulk of the contamination is in the
25 soil areas that's in heavy metals.

1 MR. COOPER: Down deeper. So as long as the
2 dogs can --

3 MR. O'HARA: Chris, while you've got your
4 emergency crews out there doing excavations, why would
5 you not take samples?

6 MR. NELSON: We don't have an approved
7 Sampling Plan, for one thing. That area is somewhat
8 co-located to an area where we're going to take some
9 geotechnical samples. So to the extent that the soil
10 material is there, and then the percentage of debris and
11 whatnot that's there can be transmitted to the
12 contractors that are going to be analyzing and
13 interpreting those samples, it's helpful. But we
14 generally don't just take soil samples without an
15 approved Sampling Plan.

16 MR. O'HARA: You won't have the Sampling Plan
17 in place prior to the time that you close the hole up?

18 MR. NELSON: The Sampling Plan is going along
19 pretty well. If it gets approved quickly -- I don't
20 know what the schedule is for fixing the hole, to be
21 honest with you. I've been trying to communicate with
22 the Utility Department. I'm not sure what their plans
23 are. I think there was some desire to try and send the
24 down-hole camera up the storm drain line and see what
25 the condition of the pipe is. So it may remain open,

1 and there may be a concurrent period where (INAUDIBLE).

2 MR. O'HARA: I am just thinking for
3 (INAUDIBLE) serendipity. If we can take a bite of the
4 apple now, you've got plenty of opportunity.

5 MR. NELSON: I appreciate your suggestion.
6 The idea would be to try and make that data point either
7 in addition to or instead of another data point. And
8 that's a very specific objective that we're trying to
9 meet in the Sampling Plan. It's a very complex Sampling
10 Plan compared to some of the other ones we've done. In
11 the Main Installation site, we've just gone out and
12 (INAUDIBLE) from the well and taken soil samples. This
13 one has very specific parameters. We're analyzing for
14 natural gas. We're analyzing for whether or not the
15 bottom of the landfill is wet, all sorts of hydrology,
16 Not so much anywhere and everywhere is the soil
17 contaminated and at what level. Because we know that it
18 may be, depending on the alternative selected. It may
19 not make that much of a difference if there's
20 contaminated soil or not. If we're going to excavate
21 it, then we know we're going to cap it, and then we know
22 we're covering it up. And if that portion is going to
23 be excavated, probably it would be characterized at the
24 time.

25 MR. PONTON: Is there a health and safety

1 monitor for the workers in the hole?

2 MR. NELSON: Yeah. We've been out there,
3 overseeing what's going on. They know to put the
4 shoring box in. When the hole got too big, we told them
5 to put the shoring box in.

6 MR. BERMAN: One last question. On the 3, 4
7 at Baker Beach and Fill Site 6, what would be the ARAR
8 activity on that? Is that more or less thought through
9 to the point where it's not going to jam up with the
10 last exercise?

11 MR. COOPER: For each and every CERCLA
12 decision document, we have to come up with our
13 site-specific ARAR list. For this particular site,
14 Baker Beach 3, 4 and Fill Site 6, we do need to come up
15 with ARARs. I think on this one, I don't think the Park
16 Service and the Trust have any disagreement.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: When we were working with the
18 ARARs before we were anticipating (INAUDIBLE). So some
19 of the issues that didn't apply to 4 and 5 but were
20 related we worked out so that when something like this
21 came along, the issues will be dealt with. So I would
22 expect no problem.

23 MR. BERMAN: You're preparing the CERCLA
24 document, but no one is actually working on preparing
25 ARARs specifically at this moment?

1 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah. Just like with
2 Landfill 4, there's Appendix A or Appendix B. That RAP
3 will be all the ARARs that apply to those three CERCLA
4 sites. And the Park Service has already seen a first
5 draft of that. That's why I feel pretty good that we're
6 on track for ARARs this time. Okay.

7 Let's spend a couple of minutes talking about our
8 tank and tank removal program. I don't know if we focus
9 on it very often, but that is chugging along right with
10 the CERCLA program. We've removed some tanks at
11 Building 1450 and 1451. We have a big project of tank
12 removal in the coastal batteries that are in both Area A
13 and in Area B. That's basically going on right now.
14 When we finish our work, we continue to send our notice
15 of closures over to the city.

16 Now our Corrective Action Sites are the big
17 petroleum releases, unlike the tank sites which are
18 smaller petroleum releases. This lists our four big
19 petroleum release sites that we are working on. So on
20 Building 1065, we've got a final work plan that we've
21 sent to the regulators. I think we're getting really
22 close on that particular document. And on the
23 Commissary PX Investigation, we also have a final work
24 plan in place. The regulators commented on that, and it
25 was pretty minor comments that I think we'll be able to

1 fix quickly and get work started hopefully before the
2 end of the month. Again, those are Investigation Work
3 Plans, not Cleanup Work Plans.

4 Building 1349, which is over by Fill Site 5, that
5 Work Plan is in earlier stages. It went under Trust and
6 Park Service review, and it's being redone. And
7 Building 207/231 Work Plan is also in the early stage
8 that's still under preparation.

9 MR. O'HARA: Before you leave the Commissary
10 PX, has a determination been made for your investigation
11 as to whether that facility is a tear-down? And if it's
12 not a tear-down, how would you propose to investigate
13 it?

14 MR. COOPER: We're going to investigate around
15 the perimeter of the buildings.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: There is some further testing
17 through the floor, a large area of the floor. And even
18 with the Commissary operators, there was a plan being
19 developed. There was going to be plans to work around
20 the operation, and now that's it not under operation, it
21 will be easier to go in and drill through the floor to
22 collect the samples.

23 MR. O'HARA: So the facility then is not a
24 tear-down?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's regardless of what's

1 going to happen in the future. The sampling can occur
2 prior to any sort of demolition, if that's in the plan.

3 MR. NELSON: We don't have to tear it down to
4 do the investigation.

5 MR. O'HARA: Okay. And that's your method of
6 doing this, instead of just to go through the site.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes.

8 MR. O'HARA: Okay. Great. Thank you.

9 MR. BERMAN: Craig, refresh my memory here.
10 The purpose of the Investigation Plans is to determine
11 the extent of the area that is affected? Will it also
12 recommend any RAP at all?

13 MR. COOPER: The next step in the Petroleum
14 Program -- so these Investigation Work Plans will have
15 Investigation Reports, data reports, that will be sent
16 to the regulators. And the next step after that in the
17 Petroleum Program is called a CAP, Correction Action
18 Plan. And that will be the Petroleum Decision Document
19 that would undergo public review and so on. So these
20 plans just don't get into remedies yet. They think
21 about potential remedies, but right now it's major
22 extent of contamination. Where are the hot spots?

23 MR. BERMAN: It's really an assessment of the
24 domain of the affected area.

25 MR. COOPER: Correct.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Some of these (INAUDIBLE)
2 provisions in the plan to do a second iteration. That
3 site had very little investigation. The first wave --
4 the version may not be enough. There's a Phase Two
5 that's contemplated in the plan to follow up and
6 identify spots.

7 MR. O'HARA: Which is the lead agency on this?

8 MR. BOGGS: That's yet to be completely
9 determined for CAP sites. If they're petroleum-only
10 contamination sites, then the Water Board would have
11 lead jurisdiction. At Building 1065 with paint shops
12 and material storage -- most of the work, 90 percent of
13 it we really think was petroleum-related stuff.

14 So until this investigation is done -- in fact,
15 that was one of our comments to the Trust. A, we asked
16 for more samples inside the Commissary, and they agreed
17 to do that. So that was good. And then B, we made the
18 point that the petroleum-only site, it falls outside of
19 a number of regulations that involve all of us here.
20 And so it's really whether they find any CERCLA
21 contaminants or not during this investigation. They'll
22 be looking for them, for metals, PCBs, solvents, and
23 that kind of stuff. But if they only find petroleum,
24 then it would be a CAP corrective action site, and the
25 Water Board will have the lead.

1 MR. COOPER: Any other questions about these
2 big petroleum investigation plans?

3 Mountain Lake. Just because it's important to all
4 of us, I wanted to have one slide. Actually, this
5 bullet is now out of date because I got an E-mail from
6 Caltrans this evening around 6:00. So at this point
7 I've been trying to schedule a meeting amongst Mountain
8 Lake PRPs. We had a meeting with DTSC what they would
9 like to see from the PRPs. And I've been sending some
10 E-mails to the PRPS trying to organize, even amongst
11 ourselves, so we can put together from a technical
12 prospective, so we can come back to DTSC with a
13 proposal. I think it's important for all the PRPs to be
14 together. Caltrans issued a letter to DTSC saying that
15 they feel they are not a PRP for Mountain Lake. And
16 that came out a couple weeks ago, the public letter, if
17 you want to see a copy of it.

18 But irregardless of that letter from Caltrans, I
19 was still seeing if I could organize this PRP technical
20 meeting, and they E-mailed me back saying they're not
21 interested in attending that either.

22 MR. BOGGS: I can provide a little update as
23 well. Two weeks ago we got an E-mail from Caltrans as
24 well. I work with our Legal Department. Basically at
25 this point, I'm working with Dan. They're having me

1 actually do some legal research to respond to the
2 Caltrans letter. The E-mail that (INAUDIBLE) staff
3 level, that one we basically suggested without
4 committing to anything. We didn't agree with the
5 Caltrans letter and suggested that they participate.
6 There's nothing in the law that prohibits the PRPS from
7 proceeding and recovering financially and legally after
8 the fact. So it's interesting. We thought they would
9 probably at least attend until it gets resolved as far
10 as their legal liability.

11 So that is a task that DTSC is moving forward on as
12 well. We lost a staff person. We have a hiring freeze.
13 They're trying to use me as much as possible. You guys
14 have me very busy, too.

15 MR. COOPER: Tomorrow morning, I'll forward
16 you the E-mail from Caltrans.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Is there any thought as to the
18 date when this might be resolved?

19 MR. BOGGS: At this point, my managers
20 recommend that we attempt another quick resolution to
21 have them involved. If this doesn't work, the legal
22 discussions can get very protracting. It would be two
23 years before we could actually get the governor to sign
24 a request to another department, basically requiring
25 them to participate.

1 It doesn't prohibit the other PRPs from moving
2 forward with restoration. It's often required in many
3 other big sites where there is numerous PRPs. Many of
4 them are recalcitrant and they are never involved except
5 at the end when it comes to paying for it. We're hoping
6 it won't go that way, but that is kind-of the last
7 resort for how things go. Basically, the Trust would
8 take over the cleanup, and then at the end when all the
9 bills are tallied up, then they start the legal
10 arguments on who pays for what.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Is the army considered a PRP at
12 this point?

13 MR. BOGGS: The Army is considered a PRP.
14 They're considered a PRP on all the sites here. Their
15 relationship with the Trust and having given the Trust a
16 number of dollars to cover the remediation. There's
17 probably some legal issues to be involved and whether
18 they're liable in addition to what they've already
19 covered.

20 MR. PONTON: Can you adjust Caltrans drainage
21 and their storm drains that lead from the road without
22 them participating?

23 MR. COOPER: I don't think so.

24 MR. PONTON: So to clean something up and
25 still have those sources come into the lake wouldn't

1 make sense.

2 MR. COOPER: Correct.

3 MR. PONTON: So you do need them --

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: It needs to be tied to the
5 change (INAUDIBLE.)

6 MR. COOPER: But don't lose heart on the
7 cleanup. Again, it's not like Caltrans all of a sudden
8 said, "Cooperate, or you'll do without the financial
9 deal." Tomorrow we couldn't start the cleanup because
10 we still have to check through the CERCLA process.
11 Mountain Lake is a site in the Feasibility Study, and we
12 eventually have to write a RAP for Mountain Lake and do
13 an RD for Mountain Lake. And the Trust is -- we are
14 spending our own money, the Army money, remediation
15 money on those activities. So we have this legal
16 enforcement side going concurrent with the CERCLA
17 process. And we hope that (INAUDIBLE) we have a RAP
18 written for Mountain Lake and still nobody -- there are
19 no PRPs around to implement the RAP. Then that's a true
20 delay to the project. But we're not at that point yet.

21 MS. YAROS: Do we have an estimate yet of the
22 cost of the cleanup for Mountain Lake?

23 MR. COOPER: Not officially. The first
24 cutback would be in the Feasibility Study as far as
25 ballpark estimates. But that's really why I wanted to

1 get the PRP technical committee together because what
2 we're looking for is the cost share. So we really need
3 to take a hard, hard look probably above and beyond your
4 typical Feasibility Study type of cost estimating and
5 really take a really hard look at what it's going to
6 cost to clean up Mountain Lake very, very carefully.
7 There will be a Feasibility Study, a cost estimate, and
8 then one in the RAP. That even might be refined more as
9 we learn more about the cleanup. I can ballpark it for
10 you. It's ballpark around 3 or \$4 million.

11 MS. YAROS: What percentage of that is it
12 hoped that Caltrans will pick up?

13 MR. COOPER: It depends on which PRP you're
14 talking to. The Presidio Trust would hope that Caltrans
15 would pay for the majority of the metals remediation.
16 That's our position.

17 MS. YAROS: The majority of it?

18 MR. COOPER: Mm-hmm -- if not all of it -- of
19 the metals, since we think there is a direct link for
20 lead contamination.

21 MR. O'HARA: Is there any empiric evidence
22 which establishes that linkage?

23 MR. COOPER: We believe yes, based on our
24 characterization data of the soils immediately out at
25 the base of those Caltrans stormwater outfalls are a

1 direct smoking gun of liability. They've caused and
2 contributed to the metals contamination in Mountain
3 Lake.

4 MR. BERMAN: Just one question here. I'd like
5 to follow up on Jim's comment here. I'm just going to
6 create a hypothesis here. Suppose you respond to
7 Caltrans and say, "Okay. You don't want to participate
8 here, but it's our intention to clean this up. We can't
9 really clean it up if you're going keep the storm drains
10 dripping into Mountain Lake. So would you inform us
11 what you would do if the cleanup was undertaken by the
12 recognized PRPs?"

13 MR. BOGGS: We could, and they may say, "we'll
14 figure that out when we get there." There's actually
15 several different issues involved with those storm
16 drains. There is one issue regarding the liability
17 through what may have come from Highway 1, which is a
18 Caltrans facility. Their argument is well, that wasn't
19 them; that was every driver that drove the highway. Go
20 after every driver that drives that highway.

21 Their second point regarding the outfalls is that
22 they have an NPDES permit for outfalls from roadways.
23 There is some questions regarding the applicability of
24 that drainage to a surface body, and then there's also
25 some questions regarding whether they're meeting the

1 standards within their NPDES permit; i.e. the Trust has
2 samples of sludge from the storm drains that's very high
3 in contaminants. It far exceeds what we basically know
4 to be NPDES discharge standards. The water though
5 that's running across those sediments may not be
6 exceeding those discharge standards.

7 So there's a few questions regarding that discharge
8 and the legal liability of it. So at this point
9 Caltrans believes they're permitted to do that. They
10 didn't have that permit historically. So there is a
11 couple more technical little legal issues involved in
12 that. However, along with this cleanup, if we deemed it
13 necessary, we can actually write an order, kind of like
14 the Water Board writes orders, directing them to
15 relocate those storm drains. And that could happen
16 outside of whether they are liable for cleaning up the
17 sediments of Mountain Lake or not. We've got almost two
18 difference issues. We've got the cleaning up of the
19 metals in Mountain Lake, which we think is Caltrans, but
20 there is also pesticides, which there's not a linkage to
21 Caltrans.

22 So there's that liability question, and then
23 there's how do we deal with the storm drains. They both
24 have some nuances and some pretty technical legal
25 questions to them. The first one of getting past the

1 storm drains we don't think is going to be as difficult.
2 We think we'll be able to get past that argument long
3 before restoration actually takes place.

4 MR. BERMAN: So DTSC has the power to order
5 Caltrans to change the drainage?

6 MR. BOGGS: We just can't say, "Go do this,"
7 and they have to do it. Because it's one state agency
8 to another state agency, there's some hoops we have to
9 jump through. There is definitely a lot of things we
10 have to exhaust before we go to what's called the GARs,
11 Governor's Action Request. We actually send a request
12 to the governor to request Caltrans to do this. So
13 that's the general process. But there are several steps
14 that our lawyers have to argue for awhile before we ever
15 get clearance.

16 MR. BERMAN: The thing is, if you go the GAR
17 route, and the legal route, as you say, years are going
18 to go by before there is any solution. During all that
19 in the next couple of winters, more sludge and more
20 material is being deposited.

21 MR. BOGGS: Well, actually, if you look at the
22 data that the Trust has collected, you'll find that lead
23 only exceeds cleanup levels to layers, almost a foot
24 beneath the sediment surface. If we cut out lead out of
25 gasoline, is our suggestion. So what's happening is the

1 real high concentrations correspond to when lead was in
2 gasoline. And the stuff that's actually being deposited
3 on top of it may still exceed cleanup levels, but it's
4 not nearly as contaminated as below the sediment
5 surface.

6 MR. BERMAN: Right. But there is also some
7 trace metals in there associated with tires, and that's
8 still going to be there.

9 MR. BOGGS: There's ways that we can expedite
10 it. There's something called eminent and substantial
11 endangerment, but we're not there. Come on. There's
12 thousands of roadways throughout this state where
13 sediment is running off, and kids play around the
14 street, etc. Mountain Lake does not operate
15 particularly -- we don't have kids messing around in the
16 sediments at the bottom of the lakes. So we're really
17 polluting people if we have to go through emergency
18 actions. So at this point, it's been going on for
19 years. It's not substantially changing quickly.
20 There's nothing we see at this point that forces us to
21 expedite things.

22 MR. COOPER: Any other questions about
23 Mountain Lake? As you know, the third prong to our
24 overall remediation program is CERCLA and petroleum, and
25 we also have lead-based paints in soils coming up. We

1 finished cleanup around Buildings 9 and 10 on Funston
2 Street. Because that was a high ecological sensitivity
3 area, the cleanup actually had to be done by hand, by
4 shovelling, basically. That soil was screened on-site
5 looking for artifacts and then disposed of off-site
6 properly. We finished some other cleanups and program
7 is rolling along.

8 The last bullet I want to point out is we're
9 actually working on a Lead-based Cleanup Plan and
10 Technical Work Plan. The Cleanup Plan will basically
11 look like, if it doesn't in fact turn out to be, a RAP,
12 or Remedial Action Plan. And so we're working on that
13 right now. Our contractor is putting that together. We
14 hope to get a version in good enough shape to send to
15 the regulators in the September-October timeframe.

16 MR. O'HARA: Does the Lead-based Paint Cleanup
17 Plan involving the Caltrans on either side of Doyle
18 Drive?

19 MR. BOGGS: The Caltrans/Doyle Drive site is
20 actually handled separately. Caltrans put together
21 essentially a draft for doing that work. That one they
22 popped through real quick. This section is for the
23 Trust building.

24 MR. NELSON: Caltrans' right of way is
25 considered (INAUDIBLE). The Trust doesn't assume any

1 responsibility for that. The Golden Gate Bridge Transit
2 District area and the Department of Transportation Coast
3 Guard Site, the PRPs and the Trust don't have any
4 responsibilities on those sites.

5 MR. BERMAN: Why is the Lead-based Work Plan
6 not a CERCLA-type activity?

7 MR. COOPER: It may end up being so. I think
8 the Trust has historically taken the opinion that many
9 PRPs have, that lead which is contained in paint chips
10 does not constitute release as defined by CERCLA.
11 Regulatory agencies such as DTSC have taken the contrary
12 position. And so the story goes for years and years and
13 years.

14 No. 1, the work that we've been doing so far, and
15 the work that we do pursuant to this plan, the most
16 important part is that it's done right and under the
17 right cleanup levels and so on. Stay tuned on that.
18 Whatever this document here -- I'm calling it the
19 Cleanup Plan -- it might be the Lead-based Paint RAP --
20 it might be called a Cleanup Plan -- it will have CEQA
21 documents associated with it. There will be public
22 comment on that. So you'll get an opportunity to
23 comment on the cleanups we've begun, and the cleanups we
24 plan on doing. Whether it's actually under CERCLA or
25 not, stay tuned.

1 At Crissy Field, we had a couple of updates on
2 this. I just wanted to tell you that basically we're
3 done. We finished the Skeet Range Cleanup. We met all
4 of our cleanup levels, and our contractor Treadwell and
5 Rollo is preparing a closure report, which will
6 summarize all the confirmation soil sampling and so on.

7 I was just walking along Crissy Field. You don't
8 even notice that there was big hole in the ground a
9 couple of weeks prior. They did a good job putting the
10 riprap back and so on. At Fill Site 7 and the 900s
11 area, in the Crissy Field area, there is a report that
12 we're preparing to show on the closure of that activity.
13 So the Skeet Range, together with the Closure Report for
14 Fill Site 7/900 areas will be the last set of closure
15 reports documenting the last set of remedial activities
16 in the Crissy Field unit.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: There will still be
18 monitoring of the 900 area. So as far as the
19 construction implementation, this will wrap up and
20 complete the (INAUDIBLE). But as far as closing out the
21 remedy, it will not do it for the 900 series.

22 MR. COOPER: So those two together, we can
23 give construction-complete type status, but not until
24 the monitoring is done can we do a final closeout of
25 that building.

1 There is another little operable unit down at
2 Crissy Field called DEH. That one, we are putting a
3 closure completion, a complete completion report,
4 because the monitoring is now done. And the first
5 internal draft of that is going to be -- Harding is our
6 contractor on that one? And it's coming into the Trust
7 and Park Service in mid-July. So once the Trust feels
8 good about that, we'll send it on to the regulators, and
9 you'll read a report about that operable unit
10 completely, and no more monitoring.

11 MR. BERMAN: Has that issue been resolved?

12 MR. COOPER: It has not been resolved.

13 MR. BERMAN: I have a question about Crissy
14 Field. There was some concern that the lagoon was not
15 large enough to actually be self-sustaining. Has that
16 issue been resolved?

17 MR. COOPER: It's not been resolved. There's
18 been a lot discussion about that issue because even
19 though that's kind of outside the jurisdiction of
20 remediation, decisions made on that particular issue may
21 impact us in remediation as far as cleanup levels and
22 what we can do and so on. I think we're definitely
23 coordinating with each other, and I don't think I can
24 say anything more at this point.

25 MR. NELSON: PTIP had a signed letter

1 basically committing to a cooperative agreement between
2 the Park Service and the Trust on further studying the
3 expansion of the Crissy marsh. That's all I know as far
4 as the commitment to further studying the possibility of
5 expanding the marsh. Like Craig said, depending on
6 where it goes, which is probably going to have to go
7 south, there could be digging in areas where there's
8 already some need of remediation. So the timing would
9 be critical in terms of cleaning up those sites
10 beforehand, so that we don't cause further problems.
11 But beyond any decisions that have been made as to where
12 the diggings are going to occur or if it's going to
13 occur, that hasn't been determined yet.

14 MR. BERMAN: It's very puzzling to a lay
15 person. People chose a certain size to make the marsh.
16 A hydrological stability with that would seem to have
17 been a very integral and significant part of that
18 analysis.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was a very significant
20 part of the analysis, working through what the minimum
21 size of the marsh was. It was anticipated at that time,
22 even at the beginning, that there may need to be an
23 expansion considered.

24 MR. NELSON: Were there real estate issues at
25 first when they chose that size, because obviously

1 there's only so much area you can use.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: There is a lot of constraints
3 that went into determining what the initial size of the
4 marsh is. It was felt that that was an adequate minimum
5 size.

6 MR. COOPER: And Brian, the issue as far as
7 potential expansion area would bump into our Commissary
8 PX?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's a number of different
10 areas that are being considered for expansion. The last
11 I heard there was no area that was excluded from that
12 evaluation. At least two of the areas of expansion had
13 contamination.

14 MR. COOPER: Commissary PX?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: And Field 731.

16 MR. BERMAN: It's possible to dig it deeper
17 too, you know, which would change the hydrology.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: That doesn't change the tidal
19 prism, because the prism is just the difference between
20 the high and low tide.

21 MR. BERMAN: That's the only factor that's
22 controlling the critical size?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's my understanding of
24 the primary factor having to do with the flushing of the
25 marsh.

1 MR. BERMAN: Because if you think it was
2 deeper -- take the limit that was something infinitely
3 deep. The tide wouldn't make any difference.

4 MR. O'HARA: Then it would be a lake. It
5 won't be a marsh.

6 MR. BERMAN: I know. It's a question of --
7 you talked about real estate south in the commissary,
8 but there's also real estate down below.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: The controlling on it has to
10 do with the flush. It's sensitive to the elevation
11 between the low tide and the high tide. So deepening
12 the marsh does not change the --

13 MR. BOGGS: Actually, the deepening decreases
14 the flush because the fresh water flows through, mixes
15 in that marsh, and so when you dig it deeper, you have a
16 bigger volume that you have to flush through to actually
17 change one volume of that water. So actually you have
18 to have a lot more clean groundwater flushing in. So it
19 actually reduces the effect that they're hoping to
20 achieve. There are conflicting things involved in
21 there.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: There are specialists with
23 the Park and the Trust working on evaluating needs. So
24 that's happening. I'm sure as that work group develops
25 the alternatives are being presented as part of the

1 program.

2 MS. YAROS: There's a model of wind patterns
3 down there. You can actually change the direction of
4 the winds. It seemed to me that would change the size.
5 Wind blowing the sand in various directions, is that a
6 major factor, other than what was dug out or how deep it
7 is, the wind current? The model was in that building
8 down there, the Crissy Field Center, and it changed it
9 significantly.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Pat, you may know more about
11 it than we do. There is a number of factors that go
12 into the dynamics of marsh.

13 MR. NELSON: One thing the model doesn't have
14 that Crissy Field surrounding landscape has, is it
15 doesn't have anything holding the sand in place.
16 Whereas there has been a lot of plant restoration work
17 that's gone on down there to enhance the dunes and keep
18 the sand in place through the roots of the plants. And
19 that model only has loose sand. You turn the fan one
20 way, and all the sand blows in the direction. But I've
21 seen the model, and it is fascinating to see how the
22 dunes resculpt.

23 MR. HULTGREN: I've notice that the inlet has
24 changed over time. It looks likes it's gotten pretty
25 shallow. Is some maintenance of that inlet required

1 from time to time?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: The goal is to minimize that,
3 so that it's self-sustaining. We anticipated that it
4 would be dynamic. I am not involved with the group
5 that's doing the regular monitoring of that in
6 anticipation.

7 MR. HULTGREN: Will they do anything to it
8 from time to time?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe that most of the
10 inlet has been monitored to see how it performs
11 naturally before any interventions is used. To me, the
12 idea is to create a system that runs itself. It's a
13 very young process. We need to understand what's
14 happening to know whether it needs any remediation.

15 MR. COOPER: Okay. The Water Groundwater
16 Monitoring Program is chugging along with this binder.
17 Jennifer Coats came to a RAP meeting in the past to talk
18 about it and made a presentation on it. So those are
19 continuing to be produced, and then they're sent to the
20 regulatory agencies, and then sent on to Mark and Doug
21 and to the Trust library for everyone to take a look at
22 it. So that's the presentation.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any more questions for Craig?

24 MS. MONAGHAN: I have one. There's a huge
25 pile of dirt on Lincoln and Story. Is that remediation

1 or is that construction?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's with the Golden Gate
3 bridge.

4 MR. NELSON: There's quite a bit of truck
5 traffic associated with that, too.

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any more questions?

7 MS. CHEEVER: I have a question about Landfill
8 4 and Fill Site 5. This is about the cost of Fill Site
9 5. And I guess the estimated cost of excavation is
10 1.376 million. And then since the total cost would be
11 3.7 million, that means that the monitoring or the
12 maintenance and operations would be a little more than
13 2 million.

14 It said the annual cost is 194,000. But for how
15 many years? How do you get from 194,000 to how many
16 years to get to this extra 2.7 million? Is it a picture
17 for 30 years or does it picture it --

18 MR. COOPER: Julie, are you looking at the
19 capping alternative?

20 MS. CHEEVER: I'm talking about the capping
21 alternative. I'm sorry I didn't make that clear. How
22 many years would you have to monitor?

23 MR. COOPER: It's a judgment call. We
24 estimated in this particular analysis, 30 years if we
25 left the waste in place and put a cap on it.

1 MS. CHEEVER: But 30 years to make \$194,000 is
2 much more than --

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: You have to invest that much
4 money to have a cash flow of \$200,000 a year for 30
5 years. It's a process to do that. It's a prescribed
6 method.

7 MS. CHEEVER: That's what's the 7 percent is?

8 MR. COOPER: Exactly.

9 MS. CHEEVER: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. O'HARA: You're using 7 percent?

11 MR. COOPER: Yeah. It's a discount rate.

12 MR. BERMAN: That's very typical. Over a
13 30-year period, the further out it is, the less you
14 know. So you take a conservative discount rate.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's a lot of criticism in
16 the number, but that is the number that the DEA
17 recommended.

18 MR. O'HARA: I was just a little surprised to
19 hear 7 percent.

20 MR. BERMAN: You'd like to know where to put
21 your pot of gold.

22 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any more questions for Craig?
24 Okay. Let's move on then.

25 For those of you who came in late, we've combined

1 topics A and C together. Now we're on topic B. Vote on
2 Proposed Comment letter on Draft Remedial Action Plan
3 for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. That's a vote by RAB
4 community members. Julie, do we have a copies of the
5 plan?

6 MS. CHEEVER: We have some patient audience
7 members. Would it be appropriate to give it to them
8 too? Please keep in mind this is just a draft. As
9 people may remember at the last meeting a month ago, we
10 started discussing this. And there were a few little
11 more refinements that were suggested. So the thought
12 was that our Planning Committee could try to deal with
13 the refinement and come up with a final thing that would
14 not take a whole lot of time of the Board to develop a
15 final wording, whether we voted to adopt it or not. But
16 at least the final wording would be there. So this was
17 discussed in our Planning Committee, and there were
18 actually eight of us there. We all discussed it and we
19 made lots of discussion. We had other suggestions
20 people have sent by E-mail. By the end of the meeting,
21 the eight of us that were there unanimously agreed on
22 the final wording.

23 Just to review what the content of it is. The
24 first paragraph is a general statement commending the
25 fact that the alternatives have been presented. The

1 first paragraph doesn't get into too many particulars.
2 It more says in a general way that we are glad that the
3 process is going ahead and that alternatives have been
4 presented.

5 Second paragraph says which one we endorse, which
6 is the preferred alternative and why we like it because
7 it permanently removes contaminated source material and
8 eliminates future maintenance and monitoring costs. The
9 committee also said that we applaud the inclusion of
10 recycling in the plan because it supports the theme of
11 sustainability and may prove to be a cost-effective
12 strategy for future landfill clean ups.

13 Then one more paragraph. We're glad that there
14 will be continued other projects. And then in the
15 letter that we passed at Board meetings, we say what the
16 vote was. And I'm not sure -- although I guess it could
17 just be a majority vote -- I'm not sure if we'd send a
18 letter (INAUDIBLE). Does anybody have any discussion
19 about the wording?

20 MR. HULTGREN: You could say, "Pursuant to a
21 motion adopted by the RAB community members," and you
22 don't have to take a position on what the vote was.

23 MR. BERMAN: I think a vote is actually quite
24 useful. I really like the idea of a vote, especially if
25 it's unanimous. It's a very strong statement.

1 MR. HULTGREN: It would be better -- if it can
2 be unanimous, that's better. But if we say it's a vote
3 of seven to three, it makes it look like a very
4 insignificant body to start with. It would probably be
5 a unanimous vote anyway. Nobody seems to be jumping up
6 and down.

7 MR. O'HARA: I'll make a motion to accept it
8 as presented and include the vote in the letter.

9 MR. HERMANN: I'll second that.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: We do have a quorum. All
11 those in favor? Opposed? Done.

12 MS. CHEEVER: We also have two proxies from
13 David Sutter and Doug Kern, but since it was no
14 opposition, I guess we'll say, "Passed by unanimous
15 vote." Should we say passed or adopted?

16 MR. O'HARA: No, passed is better.

17 MS. CHEEVER: I have this on my computer. I
18 will send it to Mark to send out, to sign it.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Let's move on to topic No. 6.
20 regulatory agency status updates and inputs. First up
21 is Bob from DTSC.

22 MR. BOGGS: I don't have too much to add to
23 what's been said. You mentioned Mountain Lake. The
24 ROD. We're hoping I guess to start the comment period
25 on the 24th. It might be a little bit optimistic, but

1 we're plowing ahead, and hopefully we don't have to
2 extend it this time. The lead-based paint has come up
3 as an issue. We are moving forward on that. My boss's
4 boss wants me to get more involved in that. I've been
5 directed to perform an audit for what they're doing for
6 the lead-based paint program. So we'll be working on
7 that as well. I think everything else has been said.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Bob. Jim, do you
9 anything else to add to that?

10 MR. PONTON: No, thank you.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Item No. 7. New business.
12 Recently released documents.

13 MR. COOPER: Right. That's me. I did not put
14 it on the agenda. I just looked at that while I was
15 standing up there, and I wrote a note in my daytimer to
16 send out an E-mail to the project managers in
17 environmental remediation to make sure that they've sent
18 out their E-mail reminders to Barbara Janis at the Trust
19 library. So that might be a little bit out of date.
20 Stay tuned. You'll have a couple of E-mails about some
21 recently-released documents.

22 I had another new business item about a newsletter.
23 I'm kind of new, so there's lots of things I don't know.
24 I know that Anna is working on the next edition of the
25 cleanup newsletter. That's moving along. And we have

1 procured a contractor to do the layout and printing on
2 that. Anna and I have been talking recently. We have
3 some ideas on how to expand the distribution of the
4 cleanup newsletter. I don't know, because we're both
5 new and I don't if there's been talk about that before.
6 We have some ideas on that. We'd like to talk to
7 whoever from the RAB is interested and we could form a
8 little subcommittee. It's probably premature since it
9 didn't get on tonight's agenda to talk about the detail
10 tonight. But we can present some ideas at the next RAB
11 meeting.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: A committee meeting.

13 MR. COOPER: A committee meeting? Okay. All
14 right. We'll do that. Are you interested, Julie?

15 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah. When we come to this
16 meeting, or when we discuss it, what I would like to
17 know is if we have ideas of who to add, we might say, "I
18 suggest that this such and such group of people be
19 added," who would within your staff add the names, or
20 look at your existing list and see if they're already
21 there?

22 MR. COOPER: We have a keeper of our mailing
23 list.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Good.

25 MR. NELSON: You have a database of it.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Representatives of the public,
2 right?

3 MR. COOPER: Right. We had some ideas. We'll
4 talk about it at the meeting.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other public comment from
6 the audience or Board members?

7 Review of action items. Newsletter talked about at
8 the committee meeting. August RAB meeting starts at
9 7:30 p.m, after public comment period from 6:00 to 7:30.
10 Letter of thanks to Willard Harris, and again,
11 membership drive for members. Any others?

12 MR. BOGGS: Along that line, I wanted to
13 introduce a friend of mine, Darryl from the audience.
14 He's an environmental studies senior at Berkeley
15 focusing on ecological restoration. And he has taken up
16 an interest in the Presidio and has come along to see
17 what we do. We might be able to hook him into joining.

18 MR. SMALLCO: Darryl Smallco (PHONETIC). I'm
19 a restoration ecologist at UC Berkeley, senior. I was
20 interested in what's going on down here, and a friend
21 told me to come along and take a look and listen to what
22 you guys have to say.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Agenda items for upcoming
24 committee meeting and RAB meeting. Newsletter topic at
25 the committee meeting. Any other suggestions for agenda

1 items, forward them to me or Craig, and we'll work out a
2 draft agenda for the next meeting.

3 MR. BERMAN: Would you like to invite Darryl
4 to a committee meeting?

5 MS. MONAGHAN: Sure. We have our committee
6 meetings on the fourth Tuesday of every month. It's in
7 Building 1750 at 7:00 p.m. You can get directions to
8 Building 1750. It's not real obvious how to get there.

9 Any other comments, questions, announcements, old
10 or new business. Seeing none, without objection,
11 meeting adjourned.

12 (The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.)

13 ---oOo--

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 RAB MEMBERS

2 Sam Berman

3 Bob Boggs, DTSC

4 Julie Cheever

5 Craig Cooper

6 Joel Hermann

7 Julian Hultgren

8 Jan Monaghan

9 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust

10 Peter O'Hara

11 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board

12 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service

13 Gloria Yaros

14 Mark Youngkin

15

16 Others Present:

17 Darryl Smallco, student, UC Berkeley

18 ---oOo---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PUBLIC MEETING ON LANDFILL 4 AND FILL SITE 5

PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO

THE OFFICER'S CLUB

BUILDING 50

JULY 16, 2002

6:00-7:30 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Welcome everybody to tonight's
2 public meeting regarding the recommended remedy for
3 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. My name is Craig Cooper,
4 and I'm the Environmental Program Manager for the
5 Presidio Trust. With me tonight from the Presidio Trust
6 is George Ford. He is the Remediation Construction
7 Manager.

8 We have a couple other guests from agencies that
9 I'd like to introduce: Brian Ullensvang from the
10 National Park Service, James Ponton from the Regional
11 Water Quality Control Board and Robert Boggs from Cal
12 EPA, Department of Toxic Substances Control.

13 Tonight's meeting is required by state and federal
14 hazardous waste management laws and, basically what I'm
15 going to start with is an overview of the recommended
16 remedy for Landfill 4 and the recommended remedy for
17 Fill Site 5. As you'll see, the recommended remedy for
18 both of these sites is the same. And I'm going to
19 provide an overview of the environmental impacts that
20 would result if we implemented these remedies.

21 And most importantly, I'm here to collect official
22 public comments on two documents. One document that I'm
23 going to be referring to a lot is called the Draft
24 Remedial Action Plan. I've got copies of that here.
25 That's what this document is. There is copies of this

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 document at the Presidio Trust library along with other
2 documents in the administrative record. I'm also going
3 to be talking about another set of documents called the
4 California Environmental Quality Act documents or CEQA
5 documents. That's what this document is. The CEQA
6 documents are actually in Appendix C of the Draft
7 Remedial Action Plan. So from here on out, I'm going to
8 use a couple of acronyms, the Draft RAP or Remedial
9 Action Plan, and the Draft CEQA document.

10 Basically, the way tonight's presentation is going
11 to unfold is that for about 15 or 20 minutes I have a
12 presentation on Power Point that I'd like to present to
13 you all and kind of work you through the key component
14 of the Draft RAP and the Draft CEQA document. Then
15 we'll take a break, and then we will collect official
16 public comments.

17 And during the presentation period, feel free to
18 ask any clarifying questions that you may have on any
19 point that I make, because that is your opportunity to
20 ask questions and get a response. During this period
21 here, during the official public comment period, that is
22 truly just for public comment. I will not be providing
23 any responses to public comment at tonight's meeting.
24 But the Trust does have to respond to all comments that
25 are submitted during the public comment period, and I'll

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 explain when that happens.

2 So this is where we are right now. We are in the
3 public comment period on the Draft RAP. The public
4 comment period is extended to July 24, and I'll explain
5 why that happened. Actually this is where we are right
6 now. We're at tonight's public meeting on the Draft
7 RAP. This is actually our second public meeting on the
8 Draft RAP. The first one was June 11. This is our
9 second one. I'll explain why that's happening.

10 After July 24, when the public comment period
11 closes, the Presidio Trust will prepare a response to
12 all comments that are submitted during the public
13 comment period. After we do that, we will finalize this
14 Remedial Action Plan and submit it to the Department of
15 Substances Control and the Regional Water Quality
16 Control Board for their signatures. After those two
17 regulatory agencies approve the final RAP, then the
18 Presidio Trust basically can authorize to prepare the
19 paperwork and documentation to implement the cleanups
20 required by the final RAP.

21 So no decisions have been made in final yet. We're
22 in public comment. This is the opportunity for the
23 public to give their input on the process.

24 One footnote before we go to the next slide. I do
25 want to explain just briefly why the public comment

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 period was extended, for the record. The public comment
2 period was originally a 30-day public comment period
3 that started on June 3rd, and was originally set to end
4 on July 3rd. That was kicked off when we issued this
5 document here called our Proposed Plan. But in
6 mid-June, the Presidio Trust and the Department of Toxic
7 Substances Control needed to make changes to the CEQA
8 documents related to this project.

9 So when we did that, we basically had to restart
10 the 30-day public comment period. And so that happened
11 around June 22nd or 23rd. So when we made these changes
12 to the CEQA documents, we extended the public comment
13 period another 30 days. So that's why we ended up at
14 the July 24 closure date now. So that's the answer for
15 that.

16 Now I'm going to do my presentation regarding the
17 remedies that we're recommending for Landfill 4 and Fill
18 Site 5. This yellow dot here is the location of Fill
19 Site 5 in the Presidio, and this smaller dot indicates
20 the location of Landfill 4.

21 Just a brief history for each for these landfills.
22 Landfill 4 was used by the Army as a disposal site.
23 Construction debris, municipal waste, and possibly
24 liquid chemical waste was disposed of by the Army during
25 1946 and 1981. And our estimate right now of the volume

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 is about 6500 cubic yards.

2 Fill Site 5 again, basically the same type of
3 disposal going on by the Army in generally the same
4 timeframe without any direct evidence of liquid chemical
5 waste being disposed of in Landfill 5. But the volume
6 of Landfill 5 is estimated at approximately 35,000 cubic
7 yards. It's significantly larger than Landfill 4.

8 So these landfills have contaminants in them. In
9 our investigation process, when we sampled the waste in
10 these landfills, we test for a variety of different
11 types of chemicals. Chemicals that exceed our cleanup
12 levels here in the Presidio are called Chemicals of
13 Concern or Contaminants of Concern.

14 For example, this gives a list of our Chemicals of
15 Concern in Landfill 4: various types of metals,
16 pesticides, PCBs, and petroleum hydrocarbons. In Fill
17 Site 5, the contaminants above cleanup level was lead
18 and some pesticides. We have contaminants above cleanup
19 levels in these landfills, so therefore a response
20 action is warranted at these landfills.

21 Groundwater. Let's talk about that a little bit
22 because that's an important issue that's being addressed
23 in this remedy also. We have some limited groundwater
24 sampling at both sites. Based on the data that we have
25 to date, it doesn't appear that we have groundwater

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 contamination at either landfill. There was a detect of
2 some chlorinated solvents at Landfill 4 that had not
3 reoccurred, but it is clear that whatever remedy we do
4 select here for each of these landfills, that additional
5 groundwater monitoring would be required because the
6 groundwater data so far is fairly limited.

7 Even though there isn't any apparent groundwater
8 contamination, there is contamination in the soils and
9 in the waste at each of these landfills that are above
10 our cleanup levels. So that means that an action is
11 required by the regulatory agencies that we have to take
12 some type of action to manage the risk posed by these
13 contaminants.

14 So the way we do this, before we just jump to any
15 conclusions, we set up our general objectives. What are
16 we going to try to achieve if we try to address the
17 contaminants at each of these landfill sites? So these
18 are our general overall objectives of what we're going
19 to try to achieve if we do something there and spend
20 money.

21 Whatever we do, we need for it to be protective of
22 human health and environment. That means no unsafe
23 exposure to contaminants of both people and to the
24 ecological receptors in that area of the Presidio. We
25 definitely want our response action to be consistent

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 with current and future land use and reuse plans for
2 those sites. And we think it's prudent that whatever we
3 do, if we do excavate the landfills, for example, that
4 we would incorporate, if possible, a recycling or reuse
5 design for materials. And of course, whatever action we
6 do, it needs to be in compliance with all states and
7 federal laws.

8 So that's our big-picture thing. So based on those
9 big-picture goals of what we wanted to achieve at each
10 site, for each site, for Landfill 4 and at Fill Site 5,
11 we individually analyzed four different alternatives and
12 potential response actions for each landfill. So we
13 analyzed the no-action alternative, the institutional
14 control alternative, capping, and the excavation
15 recycling and off-site disposal alternative.

16 So each of those four alternatives were analyzed in
17 compliance with state and federal Hazardous Materials
18 Management laws. And this slide also gives you an idea
19 of the combined total of costs for each of those
20 alternatives for both sites. I won't bother reading
21 those off to you.

22 This gives you an idea of the criteria. So we have
23 the alternatives, those four alternatives, and these are
24 the criteria that we use to analyze, to figure out what
25 is the best alternative to choose to clean up these

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 sites. And these criteria are based on a Federal
2 Hazardous Substance Management law called CERCLA.

3 There's nine criteria that we use. Here they are
4 listed. They're broken up into three different groups.
5 Basically the threshold criteria are the most important
6 criteria. That means if an alternative doesn't do well
7 or score high against these threshold criteria, they
8 can't be selected.

9 The balancing criteria are exactly that. Some
10 alternatives can do well and not do so well on the
11 balancing criteria.

12 That's really kind of the balancing and juggling
13 act that you do when you analyze these alternatives is
14 take a look at cost. You take a look at short-term and
15 long-term effectiveness. Short-term effectiveness means
16 what are the risks posed to human health and the
17 environment while the remedy is being implemented or
18 constructed. And then long-term effectiveness is after
19 you construct your remedy, what are the risks posed in
20 the long term? How effective is your remedy in the long
21 term? Implementability means just that. Is it
22 feasible? Can it be done based on current technologies
23 and knowledge known to mankind? There is always a
24 preference toward reduction of volume toxicity or
25 mobility. So that's put in as separate criteria to

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 analyze. So basically the Presidio Trust in its
2 document took those four alternatives and analyzed it
3 against these seven criteria that says these two last
4 criteria, called the modifying criteria, state and
5 community acceptance, that information is what we
6 receive during the public comment periods.

7 We have some information from the state agencies to
8 date. It's my understanding that they are favorable
9 with the kind of recommended alternative that the Trust
10 is recommending. But the state agencies can still
11 comment during the public comment period as does the
12 community.

13 So let's take a look to see how each alternative
14 did against the criteria. As you can see, the No Action
15 alternative scored very low against all the criteria
16 types, so that has been ruled out as a possibility. The
17 institutional controls, if anyone wants to know what
18 institutional controls are, basically it's setting up
19 land use restrictions; or, in this case, it is land use
20 restrictions to prevent incompatible land use with the
21 sites. But you would still have to do long-term
22 monitoring of the sites also. That's included in the
23 institutional controls.

24 It scored low against the threshold criteria for a
25 couple of reasons. We felt that it probably wouldn't be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 very protective of human health and the environment, nor
2 would it comply with statistics and federal laws in a
3 really strong fashion.

4 Capping. What that alternative is about is putting
5 a cover basically over the landfill material to put a
6 separation of the waste and the contaminants with the
7 receptors, with the human ecological receptors. The
8 capping alternatives work fine against the threshold
9 criteria. In other words, that can be a protective
10 remedy. It is in compliance with state and federal law.
11 It scored a moderate rating in the balancing criteria,
12 and we'll talk about that.

13 In comparison with Alternative Four, the Excavation
14 of Recycling and Off-site Disposal alternative scored
15 high. That's very protective of human health and the
16 environment. It complies with state and federal laws,
17 and as you'll see, the Presidio Trust feels it scores
18 high in the balancing criteria also.

19 We feel that Alternative Four is the preferred
20 alternative, the Excavation, Recycling and Off-site
21 Disposal remedy. And the Presidio Trust feels it is the
22 best alternative because it offers the best tradeoff
23 amongst criteria. There are some additional costs
24 related to Alternative Four, but we feel that that is
25 more than balanced with the additional protection and

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 long-term effectiveness of Alternative Four, especially
2 considering since Alternative Four in this case provides
3 a permanent remedy with no long-term management or risk
4 associated with it. And also getting back to those
5 original remedial action objectives, we feel that
6 Alternative Four had superior achievement of achieving
7 those original goals of what we want in a cleanup
8 action.

9 So let's talk a little bit about the environment
10 impacts. If the Presidio Trust did implement
11 Alternative Four, what would the environmental impacts
12 be of digging up the landfills and hauling them off
13 site? And so that's where these CEQA documents come in.
14 The CEQA documents analyzes that particular alternative
15 in a very detailed fashion, and it takes a look at
16 potential environmental impacts such as impacts to
17 traffic and impacts to noise and impacts to aesthetics
18 and so on.

19 There's a whole wide variety of potential
20 environment impacts that this cleanup alternative could
21 cause. But after our analysis of this, both the
22 Presidio Trust and the Department of Toxic Substances
23 Control have concluded at this point that implementing
24 the Alternative Four would actually improve
25 environmental quality. It won't have any lasting

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 negative impact. And any negative impacts during
2 construction can be mitigated; that means to be brought
3 down to an acceptable level so that there's no
4 significant adverse environmental impact by implementing
5 Alternative Four.

6 So again, the CEQA documents are called an Initial
7 Study and Draft Negative Declaration. They are at the
8 Presidio Trust library also. They are installed in
9 Appendix C of the Draft RAP. That's where they're
10 located.

11 So this is a detailed map of Landfill 4 and Fill
12 Site 5, just to give you an idea of exactly where
13 they're located. This map was put together -- just to
14 give you an example -- if we did implement Alternative
15 Four, there would be an impact on traffic and
16 transportation. This map shows which roads would be
17 shut down during the four- to eight-week period of time
18 that it would take to dig out these landfills.

19 So the red zones -- this is Lincoln Boulevard over
20 here. This is Washington Boulevard. And so you could
21 see a segment of Washington Boulevard would be closed
22 during the project, and a segment of this road here,
23 which is Central Magazine Road, which really isn't used
24 all that much by the public. But Washington Boulevard
25 certainly is used by the public quite a bit.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 So we tried to mitigate that potential
2 environmental impact. So if we did implement
3 Alternative Four, and if this road was closed, we would
4 have to set up detours to detour traffic around for both
5 car traffic and bicycle traffic and pedestrian traffic.
6 So that's just an example of the planning process that
7 we went through to think through what potential
8 environment impacts implementing Alternative Four would
9 cause and how we would mitigate or lessen those impacts.

10 And here's another example. What's our overall
11 transportation route to move the waste from the
12 landfills to an appropriate licensed landfill off site?
13 This map shows the allowable transportation routes that
14 the trucks would be allowed to use.

15 One clarification. So basically here are the two
16 landfills. The trucks would only be allowed to
17 immediately get directly onto Lincoln Boulevard, go
18 directly to Doyle Drive interchange and right onto State
19 Highway 101, and then use Highway 101 as a way to either
20 exit across the Golden Gate Bridge -- if the licensed
21 landfill we use is to the north -- or if it's to the
22 east or south, the trucks can take Doyle to Lombard
23 Street. But they have to stay on the State Highway 101
24 in order to go that direction. What's missing is that
25 they are allowed to go down Highway 1 also if the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 landfill is down that way.

2 That's another example of what the CEQA documents
3 take a look at. These trucks carrying the waste from
4 the landfills would not be allowed to just drive
5 anywhere. They can only drive down designated haul
6 routes as designated by this map.

7 So people often ask: After the cleanup and the
8 remedial action is done, what happens next? We call
9 that next step site restoration. And even though that
10 is not part of the decision-making process that we're
11 here tonight to talk about, I've added it just briefly
12 to give you a bird's eye view of what we have in mind
13 for site restoration at each of these sites.

14 What we are required to do in the remediation
15 process is comply with all state and federal laws and
16 management plans and so on. And one of those laws is
17 the Presidio Trust Management Plan that's just gone on.
18 That's our land use plan. And the other one is a
19 planning document that the Presidio Trust and the
20 National Park Service worked on together called the
21 Vegetation Management Plan. That is a separate planning
22 process with a separate public comment and public input
23 process.

24 But basically in the remediation, in the cleanup
25 process that we're here to talk about tonight, we want

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 to make sure we clean up these sites in a fashion that's
2 clean enough that is compatible with future land use,
3 that is in the PTIP or PTEMP document, and it needs to
4 be clean enough to be compatible with the budget for
5 future land use under the Vegetation Management Plan.

6 These documents don't require what the future
7 restoration will look like. That's again under a
8 separate planning process. And, in fact, tonight with
9 me is Terri Thomas from the Presidio Trust. She is our
10 Natural Resource Planning Manager. And if you have any
11 questions about that planning process and public input
12 on restoration process at any of our remediation sites,
13 Terri is here to answer questions about that.

14 But in general, the direction that we're heading
15 for site restoration at these sites would be at Landfill
16 4. That area is zoned to be restored as historic
17 forest, historic eucalyptus forest, and Fill Site 5
18 would be restored with native plants in accordance with
19 our Vegetation Management Plan.

20 There are separate studies going on as far as what
21 the exact details of what that restoration process will
22 look like. And again, Terri Thomas is here to answer
23 any questions you might have regarding the restoration
24 process.

25 Again, I'd like to reiterate that the public

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 comment period tonight is the recommended remedy for
2 hazardous waste management in the Draft RAP and the
3 Declaration of No Significant Environmental Impact in
4 the CEQA documents.

5 Just to reiterate what I've said earlier in my
6 presentation, we've closed down the public comment
7 period on July 24. The Presidio Trust writes a
8 response to all comments and prepares a final RAP. If
9 its acceptable to the regulatory agencies, they sign it,
10 and the cleanup work of that remedy would start in
11 October if Alternative Four is selected.

12 If Alternative Four is not selected, we would have
13 to basically rethink the whole process. But this is the
14 schedule under Alternative Four, the Excavation and
15 Recycling and Off-site Disposal, if that is selected in
16 the final RAP.

17 Okay. Any questions about my presentation? Again,
18 I'd like to reiterate this is the opportunity for the
19 public to have their questions answered at tonight's
20 public meeting. After the break, we'll do the formal
21 public comment period. It's strictly for the public to
22 talk and not for any agency people to talk or to answer
23 any questions.

24 MR. KALES: In your analysis, you combine both
25 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, combined them together and

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 combined all the numbers and combined all the analyses.
2 Did you do any analysis separately for each separate
3 site, and where is that individual analysis?

4 MR. COOPER: The individual analysis is in the
5 Draft RAP. The proposed plan, to make it more
6 user-friendly, we summarized the individual analyses in
7 the proposed plan and combined the numbers.

8 MR. KALES: In other words, at Landfill 4
9 excavation makes sense, but at Fill Site 5 capping seems
10 to make sense. I didn't see -- is there any reason why
11 you couldn't combine those two alternatives? You act as
12 though either you have to do all capping or all
13 excavation.

14 MR. COOPER: Each site was analyzed
15 separately, and we could select any one of those four
16 alternatives for each of those sites. It is possible to
17 select capping for Landfill 4 and excavation for Fill
18 Site 5 or vice versa. But the Presidio Trust, after our
19 analysis, individually, of each site, based on the
20 trade-offs and plus and minuses of each of those
21 alternatives, we feel excavation is the best way to go
22 for each of those sites.

23 MR. KALES: Even though there was about a four
24 million dollar difference? I guess dollars didn't come
25 into this.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Oh, no. Cost is a criteria to
2 consider, most definitely. It is one of the balancing
3 criteria. But cost is balanced against other criteria
4 such as long-term effectiveness. So we felt that the
5 incremental extra amount of cost of going with
6 Alternative Four was warranted with the additional
7 benefit you get in long-term effectiveness, in that once
8 that waste is removed from those sites, there is no
9 long-term risk management or cost associated with
10 long-term risk management if you leave all that waste in
11 place. So that doesn't mean that we are going to
12 (INAUDIBLE) other sites that we analyze down the road;
13 that doesn't necessarily mean we're going to dig up and
14 haul away every single landfill at the Presidio. Each
15 site is going to be analyzed individually and based on
16 its own merits of contamination, cost benefit and cost
17 effectiveness. But at these two particular sites, this
18 is what we're recommending based on our analysis at this
19 time.

20 MR. KALES: Now at both sites there was no
21 groundwater contamination. That's what I read in the
22 RAP; is that correct?

23 MR. COOPER: No detects above cleanup levels.
24 No sustained detects above cleanup levels.

25 MR. KALES: Which means there is no

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 groundwater contamination; is that correct?

2 MR. COOPER: Correct.

3 MR. KALES: The history at Fill Site 5 appears
4 to be different from what you summarized. Can you
5 review what's on Page 7 of the RAP? I am a little
6 confused. It seems to me that based on reading of the
7 fill site history for Fill Site 5, that nothing has been
8 put in there since 1948, based on my reading of it. And
9 it also says here that the Dames and Moore study was in
10 error.

11 MR. COOPER: Okay. The RAP says that based on
12 the waste disposal history -- we tried to piece it
13 together based on aerial photographs over time. And it
14 says that it looks like a lot of disturbance was going
15 on in that site in the late 30s, 40s.

16 MR. KALES: And then it says there was a
17 building there. In other words, it looks like it had
18 been capped and the building had been put on there, on
19 that site, from 1948 until 1969, when it appears that
20 the building was demolished. There is no evidence of
21 any change in the site from '69 to the present.

22 MR. COOPER: Right. Well --

23 MR. KALES: That's my reading of what's in
24 here.

25 MR. COOPER: Right. It doesn't say that there

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 wasn't any waste disposal during that period from 1948
2 to 1981. It just says that the evidence is not real
3 clear. The records are not very good from 1948 to 1981.

4 MR. KALES: What is the building used for?

5 MR. COOPER: I don't know.

6 MR. KALES: It housed people, presumably.

7 MR. COOPER: I don't know.

8 MR. KALES: And is there any evidence of any
9 waste disposal from 1969 to the present? According to
10 this, there isn't.

11 MR. COOPER: Correct. There's no records of
12 that. There's no records that there wasn't.

13 MR. KALES: Fill Site 5 appears to not have
14 been used for any disposal from 1948 to the present
15 based on these records.

16 MR. COOPER: It's possible that it's possible
17 that it could have been also. There isn't any records
18 one way or the other on that.

19 Any other questions about the information that I've
20 presented?

21 MR. KALES: Table 4-2. I just want to make
22 sure I understand it all, in the draft RAP. I'm trying
23 to understand why if nothing's been disposed of -- it
24 appears from the RAP nothing has happened at Fill Site 5
25 since 1948 -- why you feel that 30 years of groundwater

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 monitoring is required if capping is done.

2 MR. COOPER: Right. The 30-year monitoring
3 requirement is basically a baseline that we've used for
4 that. It is possible that the regulatory agencies would
5 require 30 years of monitoring. They are allowed to
6 require that length of monitoring, at least for
7 alternatives where waste is left in place.

8 MR. KALES: But it appears that there's no
9 groundwater contamination. Nothing has happened at this
10 site, it looks like, since 1948. And yet in your
11 analysis you say that 30 years of groundwater monitoring
12 is necessary.

13 MR. COOPER: Because again, the laws require
14 in remedies where waste is left in place, long-term
15 monitoring is required. What the frequency and the
16 length of that long-term monitoring is could be debated,
17 but we came up with 30 years of monitoring.
18 Theoretically, it could be some other frequency or time
19 period. But long-term monitoring definitely would be
20 required, especially long-term monitoring of groundwater
21 would definitely be required. Even if groundwater
22 contamination hadn't been detected so far, our analysis
23 is that the regulatory agencies would say, "You're
24 leaving waste in place. Your groundwater
25 characterization hadn't been satisfactory so far, and

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 you still need to continue to monitor and analyze to see
2 if there is a long-term groundwater impact." That is
3 our best analysis of what the implication of the capping
4 alternative would be, would be long-term monitoring, at
5 a minimum groundwater monitoring.

6 MR. KALES: My understanding of capping is
7 that you just put a layer of ground fill on top of it.

8 MR. COOPER: Right. There are different type
9 of caps based on the type of waste in the landfill. I
10 believe that at these sites, based on the type of waste,
11 we analyzed a soil-type cap.

12 MR. KALES: I looked in the back of the RAP,
13 and there were some information about the various test
14 pits that were dug, and it showed on Fill Site 5 that it
15 looked like there was already capping in place. Am I
16 mistaken? It says two to four feet of gravel and sand
17 on the top layer of Fill Site 5, which to me sounds like
18 capping.

19 MR. COOPER: So you're saying that the Army or
20 some other party put --

21 MR. KALES: Before they built a building on
22 it, they may well have capped it, is all I'm suggesting.

23 MR. COOPER: I wouldn't call it a cap. Just
24 looking at the current topography of that fill site is
25 pretty flat. So obviously some soil has been put over

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the top because it's so flat. And so whether to call
2 that a cap -- I don't know if I could go that far.
3 Usually, if you're going to -- capping alternatives is
4 basically an engineered structure that you design in
5 advance to make sure that the soil cover is completely
6 covering all of the footprints of the landfill. I don't
7 think we could say at this point that what's there right
8 now is an engineered soil cap. I really don't think
9 that would be allowed.

10 MR. KALES: Other question. Interest rate
11 used for looking at discounted cash flow was 7 percent?

12 MR. COOPER: Right.

13 MR. KALES: If a rate that is used in commerce
14 -- about 15 percent usually on capital projects -- that
15 would change the figures significantly, couldn't it?

16 MR. COOPER: Yes. Various discounts rates --
17 when you're looking at long-term monitoring in the
18 future such as the capping alternative, you change your
19 discount rate. This will change what your long-term
20 monitoring costs are. The use of 7 percent is
21 consistent with what the USEPA guidance is, and has
22 required for years. And so I don't think it's
23 inconsistent with types of present-worth analyses done
24 at other types of hazardous waste management sites. We
25 can debate whether it should be six or seven or eight or

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 --

2 MR. KALES: Or 15 cap.

3 MR. COOPER: Or 15. But 15 I would call that
4 very unusual. I've been doing this type of work for
5 about 15 years, and I've used discount rates in the 5 to
6 7 percent range. I've never gone above 7 percent in
7 this type of analysis.

8 MR. KALES: One more question, and then I'll
9 keep quiet. On Table 4-2, it shows that the actual
10 capital cost for Landfill 4 of capping is \$1,058,000
11 versus the capital cost of excavation as \$1,416,000. So
12 if you just looked at the capital outlay over the next
13 year, excavation could cost 340,000 or 350,000 more.

14 MR. COOPER: Right.

15 MR. KALES: For Fill Site 5, which appears to
16 be not as contaminated, if contaminated at all, it looks
17 like capping and groundwater monitoring, the capital
18 cost is 1,000,376. Whereas the excavation would be
19 35,136,000. And that's just the capital cost, the
20 one-year capital cost.

21 MR. COOPER: Right. That's correct.

22 MR. KALES: Okay. By capping there you could
23 save almost three and a half million dollars in current
24 capital budget.

25 MR. COOPER: If we did the remedy looking at

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 our balance sheets at the end of 2003, correct. But
2 looking at our balance sheets in the long-term, that
3 savings would be eroded.

4 MR. KALES: If you continued 30 years of
5 monitoring?

6 MR. COOPER: Correct. That's right.

7 MR. KALES: At the site that has no
8 groundwater contamination?

9 MR. COOPER: Correct. Any other questions?
10 We're going to take a short break; then we will
11 reconvene and start the other official public comment
12 period of tonight.

13 (Recess taken.)

14 MR. COOPER: I'm going to take a seat out
15 there and just kind of call on people to come up, and if
16 you want to give public comment for the record, please
17 remember to state your name and speak clearly so the
18 court reporter can hear you, so your comments will be
19 officially recorded and the Presidio Trust will respond
20 to each and every comment that was submitted during this
21 public comment period.

22 All right. Do we have anyone who would like to
23 submit public comment tonight?

24 MR. KALES: I think there's only two of us
25 here, and I'm the only one that's going to comment.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Because she's (indicating Ms. Cheever) commented last
2 time.

3 MR. COOPER: Come on up.

4 MR. KALES: I don't know if it's necessary
5 since I sent you a letter and you're going to do what
6 you want to do anyway, but I will comment.

7 My name is William Kales. I live in Cow Hollow.
8 I've been a resident of San Francisco for 30 years. The
9 only reason I got involved in this particular issue is
10 that the issue was brought up at a NAP meeting, and I
11 just got interested, and I wondered why Fill Site 5 and
12 Landfill 4 were even mentioned.

13 And so I started doing some reading. I'm just
14 concerned that money is being wasted, specifically on
15 Fill Site 5. What I'll do is just read portions of the
16 letter that I did submit for the record. I'm sure
17 you've all seen it. You all have ways of justifying
18 that I'm wrong.

19 But in any case, I think you need to take another
20 look at Fill Site 5 because I think that some of the
21 facts that are here in this RAP have been gerrymandered
22 in order to come up with a conclusion that satisfies
23 people who have a particular use in mind for the site
24 after it is addressed, I guess is the best word. What I
25 would request is that you reject the Draft Remedial Plan

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and separate the Draft Remedial Plan Landfill 4 and Fill
2 Site 5. It's my feeling that the two sites should be
3 separated and should be addressed separately.

4 In Table 4-2, as I suggested, the capital cost
5 comparisons for Fill Site 5 show that capping would cost
6 1,376,000 versus excavation of 5,136,000. As stated in
7 the RAP, Alternative 3 Capping and Alternative 4
8 Excavation both provide long-term effectiveness. A
9 discounted cash-flow analysis for the two alternatives
10 for Fill Site 5 indicates a savings of 1,791,000, and
11 you can check Table 4-2 of the RAP for the details.

12 The cash flow analysis used a cost of capital of
13 7 percent, whereas it's my belief that the cost of
14 capital of 15 percent is more reasonable. If you use
15 the 15 percent rate, the cost savings would be even
16 greater on a discounted cash-flow basis. The discounted
17 cash flow also assumes that groundwater monitoring would
18 be required for 30 years, although there's no
19 groundwater monitoring contamination existing at Fill
20 Site 5.

21 The Dames and Moore report indicates that Fill Site
22 5 was used for dumping of construction debris from 1946
23 until 1981. However, the June 2002 Treadwell and Rollo
24 RAP says that the Dames and Moore report information
25 about Fill Site 5 is in error:

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 "A more detailed analysis of Fill Site 5 conducted
2 by Treadwell and Rollo for the RAP reveals the
3 following: Fill Site 5 was used for fill and
4 construction debris from 1935 until 1948. In 1948, Fill
5 Site 5 was capped with two to four feet of sand and
6 gravel and a 7,500 square foot two-story building was
7 built on the site with parking. Pictures taken after
8 1969 show the building no longer on the site. Fill Site
9 5 has remained vacant and unused from 1969 until the
10 present."

11 Only two of the test pits of the five test pits dug
12 at Fill Site 5 reveal contamination, as far as I could
13 tell from the RAP. Based on the above, I believe that
14 the Army was correct and that no remedial action is
15 required at all at Fill Site 5.

16 "In summary, I would ask that you reject the
17 misleading conclusions contained in the Draft Remedial
18 Action Plan and evaluation of alternatives for Landfill
19 4 and 1Fill Site 5. Dated June, 2002."

20 I think you need to separate the two and address
21 each fill site separately. I think excavation may be
22 appropriate at Landfill 4, but I believe that capping at
23 Fill Site 5 is the most appropriate action. Thank you.

24 MR. COOPER: Thank you. Anybody else would
25 like to provide public comment tonight? Okay. I'll

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 take that as no one indicated they are interested in
2 providing additional public comment.

3 It's after 7:00 o'clock, so we can close tonight's
4 meeting. I'd like to thank everyone for coming tonight.
5 This public meeting is hereby adjourned. Thank you.

6 (Meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.)

7 ---oOo---

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

AUGUST 13, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

DISK ENCLOSED

Page 3

1 and how we might change it around and incorporate it
2 into the Trust newsletter. We also had a status report
3 on the Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 Remedial Action Plan, what
4 the status is of the bidding and the documents and all
5 that. And then we discussed ongoing projects briefly.
6 And our next committee meeting will be the fourth
7 Tuesday of this month, which is August 27th. That's a
8 7:00 p.m. meeting.

9 We also discussed membership, and we're starting a
10 recruitment drive for new members. If anybody is
11 interested in being a new member out there, be sure to
12 talk to somebody after the meeting or during the break.

13 MR. COOPER: And definitely, for anyone who is
14 new here tonight -- we put out the sign-in sheet kind of
15 late -- so if you're interested at least in getting on
16 our mailing list so you get our fact sheets on a routine
17 basis, make sure before you leave to put your name and
18 address on the sign-in sheets on that table over there.

19 MR. O'HARA: What is the makeup of the full
20 Board? What's the maximum?

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Maximum is 30. 20 is our
22 minimum.

23 MR. O'HARA: How many active members do we
24 have?

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Sixteen?

Page 2

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Good evening. This is the
2 regular monthly meeting of the Presidio Restoration
3 Advisory Board. My name is Mark Youngkin, the community
4 co-chair. I am the acting facilitator. Our facilitator
5 Doug Kern will return next month, I believe.

6 Does everybody have a copy of the agenda? Any
7 discussion of the agenda items? Reordering, adding
8 subtraction? Seeing none, let's move on then. Item No.
9 3. Announcements and Old Business.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would just like to
11 introduce you to the newest Park Service Remediation
12 person Tony Steffanelo. You'll be seeing him a lot.

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any old business? Let's move
14 on to No. 4, Committee Business and Reports.

15 On the fourth Tuesday of every month, we have a
16 planning committee meeting. And this last planning
17 committee was on July 23rd. We meet down at Building
18 1750 on the second floor conference room. The topics we
19 discussed that night were the comments that have been
20 received to date on the Landfill 4/Fill Site 5
21 Remediation Plan. We had a discussion of recent
22 underground storage tank removal at the coastal
23 batteries. George Ford gave us a presentation on the
24 underground tanks that have been removed to date. We
25 had a long discussion on the environmental newsletter

Page 4

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Right now, we're at 15 active
2 members.

3 MR. O'HARA: So we're minimum five. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: We did have some discussion if
6 we really need 20 or 30 members or not. But our bylaws
7 say we need 20, so we're going to have the recruitment
8 for new members.

9 We're working on the add for the paper. We've got
10 a few applications in so far, but we really haven't
11 started the process.

12 MS. JACKSON: A question and a statement
13 please. My name is Espanola Jackson. I'm here on the
14 behalf of Rosemary Cambra, the President of the Muwkma
15 Ohlone tribe, and we did have a seat on the RAB Board
16 previously. And she asked that I come tonight. She was
17 unable to be here, and I'm the spokesperson and the
18 liaison for the Muwkma Ohlone tribe of the San Francisco
19 greater Bay Area. And the fact that she's not here, she
20 asked I request either she -- and when she, in her
21 absence, that Francisco DeCosta be the representation
22 for the Muwkma Ohlone tribe. And also request a copy of
23 the Bylaws. Thank you.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: Your name is Espinola Jackson?

25 MS. JACKSON: Correct. E-s-p-a-n-o-l-a, not

Page 5

1 an i.
 2 MR. YOUNGKIN: I had already spelled it wrong.
 3 MR. COOPER: Who wanted a copy of the Bylaws?
 4 Did you, or did --
 5 MS. JACKSON: Since I'm here, I can get a
 6 copy.
 7 MR. COOPER: If we could get your mailing
 8 address? Did you sign in?
 9 MS. JACKSON: Correct. I'll do that.
 10 MR. COOPER: Great. Thank you.
 11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other comments? Anybody
 12 from the public who would like to say anything? Let's
 13 move on to --
 14 MR. COOPER: Before we do, on the newsletter
 15 thing, as a heads up, we talked about it at the planning
 16 meeting about how we're going to merge the clean up
 17 newsletter, which should be going out in the mail very
 18 soon, the latest edition as a separate newsletter.
 19 We're now talking about merging it into the Presidio
 20 Post. On my to-do list is to do a mockup, what it might
 21 look like on a page in the Presidio Post. We're working
 22 on that right now, and we should have a sample mockup to
 23 hand out at the next planning committee in two weeks.
 24 So I just wanted to tell you that's still in progress.
 25 Thank you.

Page 6

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Moving on to reports and
 2 discussions. Our first report tonight is the Landfill E
 3 Field Sampling Plan Overview. Chris Nelson from the
 4 Presidio Trust will be presenting that.
 5 MR. NELSON: For those of you who don't know
 6 me, my name is Chris Nelson. My technical title is
 7 Environmental Remediation Specialist with the Presidio
 8 Trust. I like to just consider myself a project manager
 9 for the remediation program.
 10 What I'm going to be talking about is an overview,
 11 a very brief summary of a document that we recently
 12 released. I'm going to talk about the history of that
 13 document, how it came to be. The idea is to help those
 14 people who are interested in this project into maybe
 15 reviewing the plan to get a brief overview and an
 16 understanding. I'm not going to go into a lot of
 17 detail. The plan is quite extensive. In terms of a
 18 field program, it's one of the most extensive field
 19 programs I've been associated with at the Trust for an
 20 investigation.
 21 So we've got a lot of material to cover. I'm going
 22 to get started. If you have any questions at any time,
 23 feel free to ask and I'll go ahead and answer them.
 24 I'd like to mention the overview of my presentation
 25 is that I'm going to talk about a little bit of the

Page 7

1 history of the Landfill E investigation. I'm going to
 2 discuss a summary of the field investigation objectives
 3 that were developed by the Presidio stakeholders last
 4 year and later this year. And then I'll get in the
 5 details of the field investigation and the proposed
 6 schedule coming up when we get into the field this
 7 calendar year. After that, I'll discuss some of the
 8 next steps that we're going to take. And then at the
 9 end, if there are any additional questions, I'll move on
 10 to that.
 11 So moving right along, I wanted to just orient you
 12 people who were not aware of where Landfill E is. It's
 13 this area here (indicating). This long stripe of
 14 magenta is actually a former small-arms firing range
 15 that underlays Landfill E. Landfill E is the brownish
 16 oval around that. It's the east housing area of the
 17 Presidio. And we're located roughly in this general
 18 vicinity right here in the Main Post. So it's not far
 19 from us, actually.
 20 Landfill E was a landfill operated by the Army that
 21 essentially after using the firing range which they
 22 graded into sort of a stream and canyon area, they
 23 started filling soil and debris and waste products into
 24 this canyon up to about 110,000 cubic yards. It's
 25 currently overlain by a very popular dog-walking site

Page 8

1 and a police dog training area known as Poppick's
 2 (PHONETIC) Field. So if you ever go up in that area and
 3 walk your dog, or if you ever drive in that area or do
 4 any hiking, there are some hiking trails up there. Not
 5 only is it Poppick's Field, it's Landfill E.
 6 The history of the investigation is last year
 7 following a culmination of some meetings with the
 8 stakeholders, the Trust had proposed to go into the
 9 field and collect some additional environmental samples
 10 at a number of our sites in what's known as the Main
 11 Installation Operable Unit, which is about 35 sites
 12 throughout the Presidio that all fall under CERCLA or
 13 Superfund Cleanup process. It's currently undergoing a
 14 Feasibility Study.
 15 Comments on that Field Sampling Plan led us to
 16 basically discussing the possibility of doing an
 17 investigation at Landfill E. That site wasn't included
 18 in that investigation, and there had been previous
 19 comments in the past and no investigations have been
 20 done.
 21 So the desire was DTSC and the Trust and the RAB
 22 and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have
 23 discussed in meetings in the past the idea of what was
 24 the appropriate remedy for Landfill E in the Feasibility
 25 Study process. And the Trust came to the conclusion

1 that based on cost and other factors, a cap was going to
2 be the preferred alternative as opposed to excavation
3 and off-site disposal. 110,000 cubic yard landfill, I
4 believe the cost for excavation and disposal was
5 something in the order of \$18 million.

6 DTSC said, "Well if you're going to propose a cap,
7 there is some data gaps that exist. We feel you need to
8 fill these data gaps before we can really agree to a
9 capping alternative.

10 And the RAB and primarily community members said,
11 "We feel that the current preferred alternative doesn't
12 take into account some of our concerns we'd like you to
13 look at. And a field investigation would hopefully
14 allow you to evaluate additional items of concern of
15 ours."

16 So we began having meetings with the stakeholders,
17 the RAB and the agencies and the Park Service and the
18 Trust in October and December of last year. And our
19 initial step was to develop some investigation
20 objectives. Basically sort of a wish-list of what we
21 want to do in this investigation within limits. As far
22 as financial constraints and things like that go, we
23 wanted to try to answer as many questions as we had that
24 would help us answer a lot of the remaining questions
25 about Landfill E and what was going to be the

1 appropriate cleanup remedy.

2 Following the holidays and some additional review
3 of these objectives in March and April of this year, the
4 stakeholders met again after meeting with some of our
5 technical consultants, and we refined these objectives
6 and agreed to them in principle. And basically what
7 happened from there was we give these objectives to our
8 consultants and said, "Let's write a Work Plan or a
9 Field Sampling Plan to investigate these objectives and
10 try and bring them to fruition."

11 So the information that is going to be gathered and
12 assessed during this Field Investigation and following
13 the evaluation of the data is going to help us in a
14 number of ways in the Feasibility Study process.

15 First, the way things stand right now, the
16 Alternatives Analysis, which is looking at a number of
17 different ways that you can remediate Landfill E, is not
18 really complete. If there isn't complete concurrence
19 among the public and the agencies and other stakeholders
20 on what is happening or excavating is appropriate, we
21 need to refine our alternatives analysis.

22 One of those issues that need refinement, according
23 to some stakeholders, is the cost estimates for both the
24 capping alternative and the excavation alternative.
25 Also, there were some concerns on the part of DTSC that

1 if we place a cap over the landfill, we would need to
2 look at the slope stability, because there are some very
3 steep slopes in some portions of the landfill -- the
4 northern, eastern-facing slope that's basically almost a
5 sheer drop off, and then some of the surrounding areas
6 of the former canyon.

7 We also wanted to look at -- some of the slope
8 stability issues would be if the landfill itself were
9 removed. So this was a two-pronged approach to do a
10 seismic and slopes-stability evaluation looking at both
11 alternatives.

12 Also, information gathered during this
13 investigation would help the Trust in designing a cap as
14 well as a landfill gas collection system to be used
15 underneath the cap if the site were capped. I should
16 caveat by saying this data applies under the capping
17 scenario if that turns out to be the preferred
18 alternative in the Feasibility Study.

19 And lastly, this data, we were hoping in a generic
20 way will assist us in the design of a stormwater
21 management system for both excavation and capping
22 alternatives. If you can envision a site where you
23 place essentially a very low permeable layer over what's
24 a very permeable layer right now. Water right now runs
25 on and trickles in and runs around. And if you were to

1 place some low permeability layer on top, you would have
2 a lot of water probably accelerating off the site. And
3 we're going to have to figure out how to manage that
4 water, either if we excavate that site or cap it. So
5 the list of objectives that we developed last year and
6 further into this spring were in a generic sense to
7 refine the cost estimates, as I mentioned before,
8 especially with respect to what it's going to cost to
9 excavate the landfill. And I'll get a little bit more
10 into detail on that in the future here.

11 We're also going to evaluate the hydrology, which
12 is the surface-water relationship to the landfill, and
13 the hydrogeology more thoroughly. And the hydrogeology
14 is the subsurface water, or groundwater, of the site.
15 And once we do that, we'll hopefully be able to refine
16 our Site Conceptual Model which shows in a conceptual
17 plan view what we believe is happening in the
18 environment with the landfill sitting in this canyon,
19 i.e., where the groundwater is, where the surface water
20 is, where the bottom of the landfill is, etc.

21 There were also some concerns on the part of some
22 RAB members, I believe, about the possibility of some
23 radioactive wastes being present. I think this was due
24 to the fact that no radioactive screening had ever been
25 done at the site in a number of investigations by the

Page 13

1 Army. And so we agreed to go ahead and undertake that.
 2 Then lastly on this page, related to refining cost
 3 estimates, we wanted to determine if segregable layers
 4 of waste and soil exist. In other words, is there a big
 5 area in the landfill where it's just dirt, and it can
 6 easily be removed without much sifting or sorting, and
 7 it can be stockpiled while you get at the debris? Or is
 8 it all mixed together and it's very heterogeneous, and
 9 it's not easy to deal with? If you dig up the landfill,
 10 you're going to have to put everything through screens,
 11 and shake it out and separate the soil and stockpile it,
 12 sample it, etc., and determine where it can go as far as
 13 landfills, Class 1 or Class 2.

14 MR. SUTTER: Chris, I don't recall a
 15 discussion about potential radioactive waste. Could you
 16 refresh my memory as to what type of radioactive waste
 17 people were worried about?

18 MR. NELSON: I think it was a generic concern
 19 that the Army had never screened for radioactive
 20 materials, and so the question just remained in people's
 21 minds.

22 Was it present or not? I don't believe that there
 23 had been a lot of radioactive waste findings in the
 24 landfills here at the Presidio. My personal opinion is
 25 it's not a huge concern, but it's certainly a valid

Page 14

1 concern that we're going to take a look at. When we get
 2 into some of the details, I'll tell you how we're going
 3 to do it.

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: I believe that the concern was
 5 that there has been radium dials found in other military
 6 landfills around the Bay Area in the last two years --
 7 Hunter's Point and Alameda. They found some waste
 8 radium dials. They used to use them in data boards of
 9 vehicles and all sorts of things like that.

10 MR. NELSON: Thanks, Mark. Continuing on with
 11 the overview of our objectives of this investigation,
 12 one of the things we wanted to do by drilling down into
 13 the landfill was determine what we call a halo effect
 14 of the landfill; that is, has the landfill or the firing
 15 range that was there before caused the contamination
 16 layer that sits beneath the site into the native soil?
 17 Or when the landfill ends, the contamination ends, and
 18 the native soil that's beneath it is clean.

19 So we're going to take a look at that. Those are
 20 one of the objectives that we wanted to evaluate, and
 21 that was particularly related to the firing range.
 22 There was some concern about whether or not there was
 23 lead in the soil of the former firing range.

24 Another objective was to evaluate the potential for
 25 landfill gas concentrations in the landfill, as well as

Page 15

1 trying to evaluate whether or not we could determine
 2 generation rates for landfill gas from the waste
 3 materials, and also the migration potential. Landfill E
 4 sits in a residential area adjacent to some apartment
 5 buildings, and if there is a migration of landfill gas
 6 currently or in the future, that's something we need to
 7 evaluate.

8 And last but not least, we were going to look at
 9 the slope stability, which I mentioned before, and the
 10 overall seismic conditions of the landfill. This is a
 11 map from the Field Sampling Plan that came out last
 12 month. And what it shows in the foreground, the darker
 13 areas like these lines right here by the trenches,
 14 triangles are soil gas probes that will be placed in the
 15 landfill. These circles with the hashmarks through them
 16 are proposed wells. The open circles, like this one
 17 here, are piezometers, which are wells that are smaller
 18 in diameter. They not used for collecting environmental
 19 samples for testing. They are generally to take a look
 20 at the water conditions and measure flow and presence of
 21 water and things like that.

22 I'm going to show you this map again. The darker
 23 color that you see sort-of faded back in the distance in
 24 this map, which you can see there is quite a bit of it,
 25 those are all previous investigation sampling points,

Page 16

1 whether it be soil gas, soil borings, monitoring wells,
 2 trenches and the like. This sort of northeast/southwest
 3 running line is a transect that is going to be used to
 4 do an electromagnetic survey and evaluate the presence
 5 of different types of materials in the landfill.

6 MR. BERMAN: Chris, could you just comment on
 7 the depth of the wells? Do you have any idea whether
 8 we'll actually get down to the bottom?

9 MR. NELSON: Yeah. I think on some of the
 10 wells, we are actually intending to get to the bottom.
 11 We're trying to refine the site conceptual model. There
 12 is some disagreement on whether or not there is water,
 13 if it's actually in the fill or is just in the native
 14 materials. So there will be a variety of depths of the
 15 wells; some to screen if there is water in the waste,
 16 and some to screen beneath.

17 So the first step in meeting our investigation
 18 objectives was to gather some waste characteristics
 19 data. One of the things that was done in the
 20 Feasibility Study to date, which has not been released
 21 but has been an ongoing process, was to evaluate the
 22 amount of nonhazardous and hazardous waste in the
 23 landfill by looking at past soil sample results. And if
 24 you look at the landfill, the size of it, there is quite
 25 a bit of area in certain spots that have not been

Page 17

1 investigated in the past. And so we've placed
2 strategically some of these soil borings and monitoring
3 wells and trenches to evaluate areas that were formerly
4 unknown as to whether or not they contained burn
5 materials, metal, contaminated soil, chemical wastes and
6 the like; and if the soil was just there with nothing in
7 it, what concentrations of contaminants were in it. That
8 would help us determine whether or not we could dispose
9 of that material as a non-hazardous or as a hazardous
10 waste.

11 So along those lines, we're going to put in eight
12 trenches, which will be a two-fold goal that we can
13 meet. We can not only take soil samples, but we can
14 also actually see into the landfill when we dig these
15 trenches.

16 We're also going to take soil samples from two of
17 the piezometers that we install and two of the
18 monitoring wells that we install. We'll take soil
19 samples from one of the soil gas probes to determine the
20 possible halo effects of the landfill and/or the firing
21 range. So those will be some of the deeper soil samples
22 that we take, basically at the bottom of the site in the
23 native materials.

24 As I mentioned before, we'll be able to observe
25 these trenches and the cuttings. The soil that comes

Page 18

1 out of the borings as the (INAUDIBLE) push material from
2 the bottom to the top, and we can evaluate soil type,
3 what kind of debris is in, (INAUDIBLE) borings, etc.,
4 and make a determination from looking in these trenches
5 and these cuttings if there's segregable soil without
6 debris or contamination.

7 And this is similar to, for those of you who have
8 been around and seen some of these presentations and
9 viewed some of these excavation projects at sites like
10 Fill Site 1 over in East Housing or at Landfill 4, which
11 has a significant portion of the site, it's primarily
12 just the sand that was probably placed there or graded
13 there.

14 Graded Area 9 has very little debris. It's mostly
15 soil, and portions of Fill Site 6 where mostly soil --
16 And so that's what we're trying to determine, if there
17 are big, sort of void spaces in the landfill where
18 there's no waste and it's just dirt.

19 Another evaluation that we're going to do as part
20 of meeting our objectives is gather geotechnical data.
21 This will also be done through taking samples, and this
22 will be on the edges of the landfill and in certain
23 areas throughout the site. So from eight of those
24 trenches we're going to gather this lithologic data and
25 the geotechnical data, and we'll send that to the

Page 19

1 laboratory. And then from two piezometers and three
2 monitoring wells and three of the soil gas probes, we're
3 going to obtain additional geotechnical data at the base
4 of the landfill. And then we'll also do what's known as
5 a Cone Penetrometer Test, which is a very large truck
6 that has a probe that gets pushed down from the center
7 of the truck. It has all this electrical devices
8 attached to a tip, and as it pushes against the soil,
9 the tip of the CPT rig measures the sleeve friction and
10 tip resistance, and it tells you what different types of
11 soil material are in there.

12 So as we are going through the landfill, we can
13 determine what is the strength of the material that is
14 there, what sort of strength does it have in place or
15 what sort of strength would it have to have if something
16 were placed on top of it. For instance, a very heavy
17 cap and some additional soil, would it hold up in a
18 earthquake, or would it hold up under seismic events or
19 a slope failure? And we'll also be collecting some
20 liquefaction data from these CPT tests which is
21 essentially when sand becomes almost liquid and flows,
22 and there is some concerns about that possibility being
23 present due to the former stream that runs through the
24 canyon where Landfill E is situated.

25 MR. BERMAN: In the CPT, there's going to be

Page 20

1 five borings?

2 MR. NELSON: They'll be five CPT borings, but
3 they'll be additional borings to gather the additional
4 data here.

5 MR. BERMAN: The five there refers to the five
6 CPT borings.

7 MR. NELSON: Right.

8 MR. BERMAN: And they will be strategically
9 placed around the perimeter?

10 MR. NELSON: Yeah. Well, actually we can go
11 back and see, and you can figure out where they are.
12 The CPT are the squares with the circles in them. You
13 have one in the center there. You have one there on the
14 edge. There is five, so they're all over the place.

15 So basically as you can see, some of them are
16 situated on the edges to look at the slope that's there,
17 and what would happen to that slope if we were to cap it
18 or excavate the site (INAUDIBLE) replaced throughout,
19 some of the deeper areas of the site, etc.

20 MR. BERMAN: Is this the first time that the
21 CPT technique has been used for anything here in the
22 Presidio?

23 MR. NELSON: I don't think so.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Army uses CPT at Building
25 207 and 231. So it's been used here before. It may be

Page 21

1 the first time it's been used here in the landfill.

2 MR. BERMAN: So there was familiarity with it.
3 And the information that was delivered was what they
4 said it was going to be.

5 MR. NELSON: Yes. CPT is pretty reliable.
6 There are certain strata that it can't work in. But
7 I've worked on many sites. It's pretty fantastic
8 technology to view in action. They print out these
9 little -- you've seen them.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Does everybody understand what
11 geotechnical means here?

12 MS. TRIGIANI: I have a question. Is that
13 used strictly for environment tests, or is that -- when
14 you say the Army used it, was that for structural --
15 before constructing those buildings, you've had
16 structural testing?

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: They were using it for
18 environmental purposes.

19 MR. NELSON: It can't serve both purposes. I
20 don't know if it's used for structural testing per se,
21 but you can evaluate geotechnical properties with it.

22 And lastly, on the geotechnical data, is to look at
23 a geophysical survey and a transect and a grid on the
24 landfill. And a transect I showed you earlier runs in
25 sort of a northeast/southwest position. And what this

Page 22

1 will do is allow us to look at to certain depths,
2 whether or not there are large chunks of debris present
3 in certain areas. And it also can help us find out
4 about major soil type changes, so we can possibly refine
5 our site conceptual model by looking at whether our
6 current model, that shows where the bottom of the
7 landfill is based on soil type, is correct or is off.

8 MR. PONTON: Are you going to do the
9 geophysical first and then (INAUDIBLE) -- how is the
10 sequencing going to go?

11 MR. NELSON: You know, I'm not positive. Do
12 you know, Brian?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it was first. And
14 the idea is strictly for the transect (INAUDIBLE) the
15 physical investigations along that transect (INAUDIBLE)
16 try to correlate.

17 MR. NELSON: Another objective that we're
18 trying to meet in the investigation is to gather the
19 radioactivity data that I mentioned that Mark also
20 mentioned. This will just simply be a screening
21 assessment to determine if radioactive materials are
22 present at the site.

23 That will be done in two different ways. From a
24 number of the soil samples at the trenches and the
25 piezometers, the monitoring wells and the soil gas

Page 23

1 probes, as soil comes out, we will screen those samples
2 for alpha, beta and gamma radiation using hand-held
3 screening devices. And then also we'll basically wave a
4 machine across the landfill surface to screen for alpha,
5 beta and gamma radiation in additional areas. So if we
6 start to get readings, we'll know that there possibly is
7 radiation in there. I believe we're also going to
8 evaluate background-occurring radiation for having a
9 comparison to what's at the landfill. Is that right,
10 Brian?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

12 MR. O'HARA: Where would you get the baseline
13 background information to use as your control?

14 MR. NELSON: You would go to a spot on the
15 Presidio that I believe has similar geology, and you
16 would use the same instrument to take a reading.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think they are upwind. A
18 number of examples of typical locations are put forth on
19 the Work Plan.

20 MR. NELSON: I think Inspiration Point is on
21 there.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it is. I don't
23 recall the figures either. But if you were to pull the
24 Work Plan, it does give an example of what would be a
25 suitable background site.

Page 24

1 MR. BERMAN: Some of that was done for
2 Landfill 8, wasn't it? And around the old hospital?

3 MR. NELSON: Letterman or the Public Health
4 Hospital.

5 MR. BERMAN: The Public Health Hospital. I
6 think there was some concern about radioactive materials
7 in that landfill.

8 MR. NELSON: It may have been some of that
9 under an RI. It's not an investigation on the landfill.

10 MR. BERMAN: I don't recall that.

11 MR. NELSON: Nothing has happened to that
12 extent since I've been here in the last three years.
13 But that may have occurred.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: But the hospitals themselves
15 were surveyed for radiation.

16 MR. NELSON: Yeah. There was an NRC study
17 that was done to close it down.

18 MR. BERMAN: They went not only in the
19 hospital, but they did the perimeter too.

20 MR. NELSON: It's not ringing a bell? Is it
21 Mr. DeCosta?

22 MR. DeCOSTA: Six years ago when Montgomery
23 Watson was here, we had maps about this toxic hot spots.
24 We also had concrete information of some of the stuff
25 that was put in that landfill that came from the

Page 25

1 hospital and from the LAIR, Army Institute of Research.
2 So that gives you an idea. Now my thing is you eluded
3 to a stream. Are you talking about the Alpolin
4 (PHONETIC) Spring?

5 MR. NELSON: No. It's a former spring-fed
6 spring that consisted of the western-most branch of
7 Tennessee Hollow, which is a former riparian corridor
8 that arrived in that area of pre-Army filling and
9 whatnot.

10 MR. DeCOSTA: Anyhow, if the watershed is
11 contaminated, and I'm talking about the watershed in the
12 larger area, in that area. If the watershed is
13 contaminated, do you think -- this is just -- I'm asking
14 you a question. You may answer it, or you may not
15 answer it. Do you think that whatever the substances
16 are in this large landfill have contaminated the Alpolin
17 Springs? Do you see a possibility?

18 MR. NELSON: I don't think they could possibly
19 be connected, because there is a ridge between the two,
20 and water would basically have to travel over the ridge
21 and over there. And water is basically flowing downhill
22 from Landfill E towards the Bay. If we look back at
23 this map that shows the sites, Alpolin Spring is here,
24 and Landfill E is here. And this is a ridge that runs
25 between the two. Actually I guess the ridge is kind-of

Page 26

1 here, and it kind-of creeps up on this side. You have a
2 residential neighborhood, a residential neighborhood, a
3 hillside, and this whole area here is basically feeding
4 the water that goes to Alpolin Spring. If you were to
5 walk up this direction in either way, you would find
6 very narrow, steep canyons. And I don't believe that
7 the water that's here is hydrologically connected to
8 this.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: The groundwater at Landfill E
10 appears to go to the north and northeast. It appears to
11 go back towards the bay in this direction.

12 MR. COOPER: So any contamination here would
13 go this way.

14 MR. NELSON: But there are currently
15 monitoring wells that the Army and the Trust have been
16 monitoring. We're going to be able to use -- I'm going
17 to speak to this in a little bit -- we're going to be
18 able to use that historical data to evaluate the water
19 quality of the site.

20 MR. YOUNG: And there are seeps at the base of
21 Landfill E that are being sampled for contamination.

22 MR. NELSON: Right. When they occur.

23 Were we on landfill gas? I think we were. I
24 mentioned before in the introduction that there were
25 some concerns about landfill gas. I think this is the

Page 27

1 only landfill at the Presidio where measurable amounts
2 of landfill gas have been detected. Back in 1996, which
3 I think is the investigation Mr. DeCosta was speaking
4 to, Montgomery Watson came before the RAB and the public
5 and talked about a pre-design investigation they were
6 doing. As part of that, and I think also as part of the
7 remedial investigation, some landfill gas was detected.

8 Now that was a long time ago. We don't know what
9 the current situation is, and so this is a good time to
10 take a look at landfill gas for a number reasons; like I
11 mentioned before, the possibility of it migrating, the
12 possibility of it being generated and siphoning gas off
13 into the atmosphere. And if the site is capped, where
14 is that landfill gas going to go, and how are we going
15 to vent it or capture it?

16 MR. SUTTER: (INAUDIBLE) detection of methane?

17 MR. NELSON: Methane. I think there were a
18 few VOCs -- volatile organic compounds -- that were
19 detected. I think methane was the highest of all of
20 them. But it was quite low in comparison to municipal
21 landfills.

22 In the landfill gas assessment, what we're going to
23 do is -- just like we did with the radiation survey,
24 we'll have a hand-held device to sample gas -- if
25 they're present -- from soil samples that come out of

Page 28

1 the trenches, the piezometers, the monitoring wells, the
2 borings for the soil gas probes, and the soil borings.
3 And we're going to screen those specifically for
4 methanes sulfite, and organic vapors.

5 Then there will be some soil gas probes that will
6 be placed inside one of the soil borings and completed
7 as a testing probe that can be used over time within the
8 waste material to gather this landfill gas data. And
9 then there were also be two tested landfill soil gas
10 probes installed adjacent to the landfill to gather the
11 migration potential information. Those will be on the
12 side where the houses are on MacArthur. Forey
13 (PHONETIC) Road, actually. It goes up to a dead end
14 next to Landfill E.

15 The landfill gas samples from within the soil gas
16 probes will be collected using a Summa canister.
17 Basically it's an evacuated metal canister that you put
18 into this probe and it sucks the gas in over time, and
19 you can then analyze it in a laboratory. We'll be
20 analyzing for major gases and volatile organic compounds
21 in those Summa canisters.

22 We're also going to be looking at wells near the
23 edge of the landfill to look at the hydrogeology at the
24 groundwater levels at the southern and western sides of
25 the site. That will assist us in evaluating our site

1 conceptual model. We're also going to be looking at
 2 refining our estimates of the depth of the water-bearing
 3 formations at the south end at the edges of the
 4 landfill. And this will help us determine how deep of a
 5 subsurface diversion barrier we have to place if
 6 groundwater were flowing downhill and coming into
 7 contact with the waste. Under the capping alternative,
 8 we have to make sure that water wasn't coming through
 9 the ground and impacting the landfill. We want it to go
 10 around the landfill and not be contaminated as it leaves
 11 the site.

12 So this is just a summary of all of the different
 13 sample locations I've just gone through. Soil gas
 14 probes, trenches, borings, piezometers, and monitoring
 15 wells, as well as screening for radiation.

16 Further to the hydrology and hydrogeology
 17 evaluation we're going to be doing outside of the field
 18 program, we're going to be looking at a runoff study
 19 that was conducted by one of the Trust consultants who
 20 was working on the Tennessee Hollow Riparian Corridor
 21 Restoration Project. That will basically tell us what
 22 size the watershed is in that area, basically how much
 23 water could we consider to be coming onto the site
 24 during different rain events.

25 We'll also be taking an updated look at the water

1 actually dry oftentimes, or there is not enough water in
 2 it to collect a sample during the dry months. But in
 3 the winter months, it causes a perched water table
 4 effect.

5 Also you notice the groundwater level in this
 6 figure has risen up as a result of the winter rains and
 7 the higher level of infiltration, both from uphill in
 8 the canyon where groundwater flows, and then also
 9 surface water that runs onto the site.

10 So currently the thinking on this conceptual model
 11 is that it could be refined, and hopefully through
 12 collection of this hydrogeologic and hydrologic data,
 13 and looking at some of the borings and piezometers and
 14 wells, we'll be able to figure out whether or not this
 15 is actually accurate, or whether there is some other
 16 site conceptual model we need to develop.

17 This just shows another cross-section. It just
 18 shows the different conditions. You can see the
 19 groundwater table is higher in the winter and lower in
 20 the summer and it doesn't have the groundwater No. 7,
 21 and that's because it's looking at a different
 22 direction.

23 MR. BERMAN: Chris, what is the estimated
 24 thickness of the native soil?

25 MR. NELSON: The native soil beneath the

1 quality impacts based on the latest data that's been
 2 collected at the site and historic data, both from the
 3 Army and from the Trust. And using this information,
 4 we'll be able to hopefully update the site conceptual
 5 model based on these data collection efforts.

6 And I'm going to show you what our site conceptual
 7 model looks like right now. It's a little bit skewed,
 8 but if you look at these letters here, the A, A', and B,
 9 B', these are the transects that we're currently using
 10 to evaluate the Site Conceptual Model. These were drawn
 11 by our consultant Erler & Kalinowski who prepared the
 12 Field Sampling Plan.

13 This is the Site Conceptual Model as it stands
 14 right now. It looks at the possibility of water moving
 15 into the landfill by a surface infiltration and then
 16 also regional groundwater flow. So in the summer
 17 conditions, you can see it shows the water being much
 18 deeper. There's less water coming through the landfill.
 19 And in this area in the northeastern part of the site
 20 right here, you can see there is no water. Also it
 21 shows that there is no water currently coming into
 22 contact with the waste materials.

23 Then in the winter conditions on that same
 24 transect, you can see what's been observed in the past
 25 is a perched layer of water in this well GW07. It's

1 landfill?

2 MR. BERMAN: Between the landfill and the
 3 water table.

4 MR. NELSON: I'm not sure, off the top of my
 5 head.

6 MR. BOGGS: If you turn back one slide --

7 MR. COOPER: The thickness right here
 8 (indicating).

9 MR. NELSON: I think the green represents the
 10 Franciscan bedrock, which is the bottom layer of
 11 materials. And the water is present between the Colma
 12 formation, which is the (INAUDIBLE) and the
 13 serpentinite.

14 MR. COOPER: So it looks like in some places
 15 this could be 20-feet separation here and more at other
 16 places?

17 MR. BERMAN: It looks like -- if your
 18 conceptual model stands to be correct, it looks like
 19 there is a very safe distance between the water table
 20 and the actual fill itself, unless there have been some
 21 openings that have been made by the geological pressures
 22 that developed from the landfill there. It does look as
 23 if it's, you know, a fairly safe environment for
 24 capping. 20 feet is a fairly sizeable amount.

25 MR. NELSON: Right. And if you look at the

1 historical groundwater data at the site, there are some
 2 anomalously high metals, levels, in some wells. But it
 3 doesn't show consistently over time high levels of
 4 contaminants, especially organic contaminants, that
 5 point to a continuing releasing source of waste from the
 6 site. And hopefully with EKI taking a closer look at
 7 all the years of groundwater monitoring and the latest
 8 three or four quarters that we've done, we'll be able to
 9 make a solid assessment of what's going on. And I think
 10 there's been some disappointment on the amount of number
 11 of wells that are present at the site, whether they're
 12 configured properly. So now that we're putting new
 13 wells in, we'll be able to even better take a look at
 14 the groundwater conditions at the site.

15 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Prior to the landfill
 16 material being placed there, you say there was a stream.
 17 Was that a seasonal stream, or does anybody know?

18 MR. NELSON: My guess is that it was probably
 19 a very -- I can only guess, really. What's going on
 20 right now is the Tennessee Hollow Watershed is being
 21 studied from current conditions, and they're trying to
 22 develop a model that would look at -- minus a lot of the
 23 pavement and a lot of the grading and a lot of the
 24 upstream area not being paved as much and there being
 25 more infiltration -- what kind of realistic flow regime

1 existed in this Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor.
 2 This was the western branch of it. There were maps that
 3 we've seen that show a pretty sizeable number of
 4 springs that flowed out of the hillsides and down into
 5 this drainage.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Wouldn't that suggest that the
 7 watertable would have reached the bottom of that ravine?

8 MR. NELSON: Perhaps, but you have to remember
 9 this landfill is essentially a plug. It's filling that
 10 canyon. If there's significant layers of material that
 11 aren't permeable enough, and the groundwater has ceased
 12 to rise to that historic level, then it may be much
 13 deeper than it was before. And also, you have to keep
 14 in mind they probably just mowed through with bulldozers
 15 the Colma formation that was there that the stream was
 16 trickling through to build the firing range. So you had
 17 purbation prior to the landfilling. And who knows what
 18 happened in terms of purbation when it started
 19 landfilling, if they did even more grading.

20 MR. O'HARA: The metals that are in the
 21 groundwater, are they above background readings; and if
 22 so, is there anything upgradient that would account for
 23 them being?

24 MR. NELSON: I believe the anomalous levels I
 25 was talking about are in downgradient or cross-gradient

1 wells within the landfill. I think it was nickel and
 2 cadmium.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: Nickel was high in the one
 4 well that may or may not be downgradient. There really
 5 hasn't been a determination of background levels in the
 6 groundwater, so it's not an easy answer. The nickel
 7 does appear to be high in the one well. That could be
 8 an anomaly. It could also be something anomalous with
 9 that one particular well and in that very local area, it
 10 could adapt.

11 I think that's part of what this additional
 12 investigation would do, now that there are more data,
 13 particularly with some additional wells, we get to see
 14 if we should be concerned if it's a pattern that's
 15 indicative of something coming from the landfill or if
 16 it is something that would be more indicative of a local
 17 natural phenomena.

18 There really, other than the landfill, there have
 19 not been any sources identified in this general area,
 20 and the firing range. But the firing range would not be
 21 a source (INAUDIBLE).

22 MR. NELSON: The Army really only did one
 23 sort-of concerted effort to look globally at background
 24 groundwater conditions, and that was when they were
 25 evaluating hexagammachromium in groundwater. And I

1 think if you were to do a background study on
 2 groundwater at Landfill E, you probably would want to
 3 place the wells closer to the site than where some of
 4 these wells where the hexagammachromium were replaced
 5 proximal to the landfill and similar geological
 6 conditions, but not so far away that they could be
 7 possibly improperly interpreted based on other
 8 conditions. So, like Brian said, we're hoping that
 9 putting in some additional wells will shed some light on
 10 this quandary that we're in.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the things that Chris
 12 pointed out, which may not be clear, is that some of the
 13 wells are actually going to the south and west of the
 14 landfill which will help to refine the flow path for the
 15 direction of flow of the groundwater, which will help
 16 indicate whether it's coming from the landfill or not.
 17 If it's not coming from the landfill, it's unlikely that
 18 there is landfill contamination.

19 MR. NELSON: So you see, this is a new well
 20 that is basically across from -- this is the most
 21 upgradient well at the site. There is another well here
 22 which is the western-most well. The closest existing
 23 one to that one is -- it's pretty busy there.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's down by the slope.

25 MR. NELSON: Right. Down there. So we're

1 really capturing some information that's been long
2 missing from the sites.

3 We did go through a lot of these sample locations
4 -- I think all of them -- with some RAB members and some
5 other stakeholders. So I don't think that the selection
6 of these locations is a surprise. It's just that this
7 is the first time it's been shown in this fashion.

8 MR. PONTON: Chris, in terms of background,
9 which one of the upgradient of the landfill, is outside
10 the landfill?

11 MR. NELSON: Well, optimally yes. I don't
12 know why it was that the decision was arrived at to not
13 go off the landfill. It may have been based on --
14 again, I know you're going to be tired of hearing this
15 excuse -- but terrain issues. If you recall, once you
16 get off the edge of the landfill, you're basically in a
17 wetland area to the south, and then a very steep -- I'm
18 sorry. I'm pointing at a screen. You can't see.

19 This area here is one of those little canyons I was
20 talking about. It's very steep. And then there's a
21 similar one that's not as pronounced that comes down
22 this way. They're very wooded, thick with ivy and other
23 things. I believe that when the Army put this well in,
24 they thought that was upgradient, is that right?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: They attributed it to being

1 to hit the refusal. I think with the standard drill
2 rig, you're going to want to go pretty much straight
3 down, but there are other technologies that can be used
4 to bore more diagonally or horizontally. I have to
5 admit, I was not present for some of these meetings
6 later this year because I was on paternity leave. So
7 people like Craig or Brian or Bob or Jim could maybe
8 speak to why particular background locations were not
9 chosen.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: If you flip over to the cross
11 section AA, I think it may show that the Franciscan
12 bedrock comes up. So there really isn't the Colma.

13 MR. NELSON: Oh, okay. Right.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: If you look at Colma
15 (INAUDIBLE) thins out. I'm not sure about that. But
16 that's my recollection as to why it was -- one of the
17 reasons why it was difficult to go upgradient.

18 MR. NELSON: So basically the idea is that you
19 drill straight into bedrock, and you wouldn't even get
20 water, I guess.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was the theory. If you
22 did get water, it wouldn't be representative of the
23 water that you would be seeing in the Colma formation
24 downgradient.

25 MR. NELSON: So it wouldn't be an apples and

1 upgradient, but they also neglected to note that they
2 went through six feet of waste.

3 MR. NELSON: It's important to point out also
4 that this sort-of bullet-shaped landfill that we have
5 here depicted on this map is based on an assessment done
6 by our consultants Erler & Kalinowski in 1998. It's
7 much larger than what the Army had portrayed in their
8 Feasibility Study in 1997. But then they later came
9 back and did a similar evaluation and said the landfill
10 could actually be a little bit bigger. So if you see
11 former trenches and the like that don't appear to be
12 anywhere near the edge of the landfill, or wells or
13 borings that look like they were maybe intended to be
14 background, and they're right in the landfill, it's
15 because of this layer assessment that evaluated the land
16 to be larger in area, in size.

17 MR. BERMAN: In the boring there, at the tip,
18 could also be done in a tangential fashion so that they
19 could get around this thing, the difficulty of getting a
20 boring truck in there with that steep gradient. And
21 they could poke the hole at an angle, so to speak, and
22 they could actually get the upgradient information from
23 that, if that was desirable. There is no restriction on
24 the boring angle itself, is there?

25 MR. NELSON: Only whether or not you're going

1 apples comparison.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there any evidence that the
3 nickel could come naturally from the Colma?

4 MR. NELSON: I think more likely naturally
5 from the serpentinite. But yeah, there is some
6 indication of that.

7 Okay. So this is a proposed schedule. The main
8 points, the highlight here, are that if we want to get
9 in the field this year, which would be basically early
10 to late October -- that would be the time we'd be in the
11 field -- we would have to receive comments in writing
12 from agencies in the RAB by about the middle of
13 September. I mean, this is sort of the optimal, if
14 we're going to make it work, everything-falls-into-place
15 type of schedule. And then we could get a Draft Field
16 Report to the agencies and the RAB by early next year if
17 we were to get in the field. And depending on the
18 status of the Feasibility Study and where things lie
19 with that, we could either append this field report to
20 that and use the data to evaluate Landfill E
21 alternatives in a later assessment, or if they marry
22 together in timing, then all begun at once. It would
23 certainly be helpful if the Feasibility Study comes out
24 before we get our field results back.

25 MR. SUTTER: Do you see any problems with

Page 41

1 reviewing the first four bullets?

2 MR. NELSON: Well, I know from talking to Bob
3 today, that there is more than just him looking at this.
4 I don't know what kind of a schedule you've put Ron on
5 to review this document.

6 MR. BOGGS: Well, he left literally two days
7 after we got the report. I put the request in. I don't
8 know what his priorities are, work-load, if it's a
9 first-come, first-serve. He's our DTSC landfill guru.
10 We had one other geologist that primarily focuses on
11 landfills. He doesn't come with the reputation that Ron
12 does.

13 MR. NELSON: I think one of the things we did
14 when we put together this investigation was to consult
15 with Bob and to work with one of our subcontractors,
16 EKI, who actually worked with Ron and pretty much knows
17 the kind of things that he's looking for. So hopefully
18 we've been able to hit a lot of the nails on the head
19 with this. Because this has been a collaborative
20 effort, and we've discussed the objectives and what
21 we're trying to achieve here in this investigation over
22 many months, we're hoping that this will meet everyone's
23 expectations and we won't get a significant amount of
24 comments. If that's the case, there won't be much to do
25 in terms of revising the document and getting it out.

Page 42

1 As long as Bullet No. 3 and 4 can fall somewhere within
2 that window of time, I think we're in pretty good shape
3 to get out there this year. I don't know if we're going
4 to want to risk out getting out there when the days are
5 much, much shorter and the rain is much more likely,
6 because it could just be kind of messy to be digging
7 drenches in our biggest landfills in the mud. So if we
8 don't make some of these dates by six weeks or so, we
9 may end up waiting until next year.

10 MR. SUTTER: Well, that was my concern.

11 MR. NELSON: We might have to do it later,
12 earlier next year when there's less likely to be weather
13 problems.

14 MR. SUTTER: What kind of prioritization is
15 there in the remediation program at this time at this
16 point?

17 MR. NELSON: Well, Landfill E is part of the
18 main installation. So it's in the Feasibility Study
19 right now. Because we've taken out this portion of the
20 project to look at some additional data gaps and later
21 refine the alternatives analysis, it may catch up in the
22 Feasibility Study or it may track separately, and it
23 could be spun out as its own site. Probably what I
24 envision is they'll be a Main Installation RAP -- if we
25 can get approval on the Feasibility Study -- and then a

Page 43

1 Landfill E RAP will probably follow potentially because
2 there is a lot of other issues that are sort of lagging
3 on a lot of the other main installation sites. And I'm
4 speaking primarily to -- where the Feasibility Study is
5 now -- if we were to put it out tomorrow, there would be
6 no preferred alternative to Landfill E. We'd get up to
7 a point where we would evaluate the alternatives that we
8 had before us, but we would have to say, based on the
9 data we have, we can't really put forth the preferred
10 alternative. And so that would have to catch up later
11 on.

12 So the next steps we're going to take is, like I
13 said, the agencies in the RAB are reviewing the draft
14 document, the Field Sampling Plan, right now, and
15 hopefully we'll get some written comments from them in
16 the not-too-distant future, hopefully within the month
17 of September, at the latest. We're going to look at
18 those comments and incorporate them into the draft and
19 issue a final Field Sampling Plan. At the same time,
20 we'll be obtaining utility clearance and underground
21 clearance for digging and excavating at the site. And
22 then there be some activities going on behind the scenes
23 preparing for field effort, including making sure that
24 our investigation complies with the laws that are set
25 forth to protect the national park, like the National

Page 44

1 Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic
2 Preservation Act.

3 So that goes through an internal Trust process.
4 We'll also have EKI scheduling labs and drillers and
5 other subcontractors. And then from there, we get out
6 in the field and conduct the investigation. So that is
7 a very large nutshell of Landfill E. Any questions?

8 MS. BLUM: What is capping?

9 MR. NELSON: Capping is where you take
10 material that's low permeability, like high density
11 polyethylene or clay or very low-permeability soil, and
12 you place it over the landfill. And you cover the
13 landfill in its entirety to keep water from infiltrating
14 into it. The idea being that you can entomb the
15 landfill and make it dry, and therefore nothing is going
16 to leach out of it. So that's the capping that I've
17 talked about.

18 MS. BLUM: I have another question. Since
19 Tennessee Hollow is such a high priority with the Trust,
20 I believe you said your preference already was for
21 capping rather than excavation due to cost.

22 MR. NELSON: I said that the current
23 assessment, based on the data we have, is that there's a
24 very large difference between capping and excavation.
25 We're hoping that this investigation will either confirm

Page 45

1 that or show us something else that is more feasible,
 2 perhaps excavating a portion of the landfill that's not
 3 as contaminated to allow for a more harmonious
 4 restoration of Tennessee Hollow. But if that delta does
 5 not change as a result of this investigation and the
 6 alternatives analysis, we're going to have to be pretty
 7 creative about how we cap the site to allow for the
 8 restoration, because the restoration is going to happen.
 9 We know that. And we're trying to work with the
 10 planning side of the house to make sure that we're in
 11 communication, and we are aware of their needs, and vice
 12 versa.

13 MS. BLUM: This body is also working on the
 14 restoration of Tennessee Hollow?

15 MR. NELSON: There may be a tangential
 16 interest, but it's not something that they generally get
 17 involved in. It's more of a planning thing.

18 MS. BLUM: Is the working relationship very
 19 close with the restoration and the landfill remediation?

20 MR. NELSON: Yeah. The remediation program
 21 and planning work closely together on any projects that
 22 overlap. And there are a number of sites in the
 23 Tennessee Hollow Restoration corridor that overlap with
 24 planning efforts. Two of them I've mentioned before,
 25 Fill Site 1 and Fill Site 6. So we're working with

Page 46

1 them. We're aware of some of the needs of the
 2 restoration project, and we've kept that in mind when we
 3 move forward with looking at the alternatives analysis
 4 in the Feasibility Study and what's best for a) the
 5 environment and b) the restoration.

6 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

7 MR. COOPER: Just to clarify, we really don't
 8 have a preferred alternative for Landfill E right now.
 9 That's what this whole sample plan is to give us more
 10 information so we can make a new recommendation. In the
 11 past, we were recommending capping, but it's an open
 12 plate at this point. We'll just collect the new
 13 information and see what happens, and we'll make a new
 14 recommendation. It might be capping; it might be
 15 excavation.

16 And as far as the planning process, the Presidio
 17 Trust Management Plan, basically it recognizes Landfill
 18 E in the middle of the Tennessee Hollow corridor. That
 19 particular planning document envisions both options,
 20 basically. The remediation program could elect to
 21 excavate out the landfill material, and then we would
 22 restore that area. Or if the remediation program capped
 23 it, then there was a land use for that also, I think as
 24 a ball park or something like that. So the overall
 25 management plan, the land use plan, envisioned either/or

Page 47

1 type of process.

2 MR. NELSON: Which is congruent with what this
 3 investigation is looking at. It's kind of one or the
 4 other, and what's the best alternative.

5 MS. JACKSON: Piggy-backing on what you said
 6 about the capping. Is there a possibility even when it
 7 is capped, the contamination could travel?

8 MR. NELSON: Yeah. There's a possibility, but
 9 there would also be additional things put in place to
 10 make sure that if something were migrating from the site
 11 that it could be detected and something could be done
 12 about it. And that would be generally surface water
 13 monitoring and groundwater monitoring.

14 MR. COOPER: If we do have a capping
 15 alternative, you just don't cap it and walk away. You
 16 continue to monitor, to check for the landfill gas, for
 17 example. You want to make sure the landfill gas is not
 18 moving away underneath the cap. They'll probably even
 19 be a capture system for that to collect it. But we'll
 20 monitor and keep monitoring that and recheck the
 21 groundwater underneath the landfill. So even though the
 22 cap would be trying to dry out the landfill, we would
 23 still check, because contaminants can still trickle down
 24 and get into groundwater, even underneath the cap. It's
 25 possible, right.

Page 48

1 MS. JACKSON: How often would it be, the
 2 monitoring?

3 MR. COOPER: What would be the monitoring
 4 program under a capping scenario?

5 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

6 MR. COOPER: The frequency, we'd have to talk
 7 to the regulators about that. I think it would probably
 8 be more frequent at first. But it would be something in
 9 perpetuity we'd have to monitor for, forever. Maybe
 10 quarterly for some things and semiannual and annual for
 11 other things. But no less than annual.

12 MS. JACKSON: Another question, and I'll be
 13 finished. On the ecological part, it's close to where
 14 the rivers were? The streams? And people were living
 15 there at one time? Have there been a survey of that
 16 area?

17 MR. NELSON: Archeological resources? I don't
 18 think that's been a major issue of concern.

19 MS. JACKSON: It should be.

20 MR. NELSON: I don't think it shows up on any
 21 of the maps that we have, but --

22 MS. JACKSON: It would not show on your maps.
 23 That's the reason why I'm asking.

24 MR. NELSON: I know there are several
 25 prehistoric sites that show up in these areas of

1 concern.

2 MS. JACKSON: That was once the finding had
3 been done, and not before. That was after the finding,
4 and not before.

5 MR. NELSON: Which finding are you speaking
6 of?

7 MS. JACKSON: The one that contains
8 notifications of. Once they start digging, is when they
9 found, and then they show up on the map.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Most of the sites are unknown,
11 she's saying.

12 MS. JACKSON: They're all unknown.

13 MR. DeCOSTA: Let me clarify something. Only
14 three percent of the Presidio has been archaeologically
15 surveyed. So when we had a project like the Crissy
16 Field Project, we learned a lot. Now we are working on
17 the Doyle Drive Project. We are learning a lot. But
18 the area that you mentioned, that whole area, including
19 Alpolian Springs, 10,000 years ago, people lived there.
20 So the probability of finding archeological remains in
21 that whole area are great, including this whole
22 so-called Cow Hollow --

23 MR. NELSON: Tennessee Hollow, yeah.

24 MR. DeCOSTA: -- and riparian -- wherever you
25 have wooded areas, streams, going all the way down to

1 believe there's a plan to have monitors in place for
2 this investigation, but I know that if we were
3 excavating and this became an issue, I'm sure that would
4 probably have to be the case.

5 MR. O'HARA: Chris, if in your exploration
6 work, especially when you've got down to native soils,
7 if you discovered artifacts, would there be a
8 consideration of evacuation because you found artifacts?

9 MR. NELSON: You mean complete removal of the
10 site?

11 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

12 MR. NELSON: To expose them or protect them or
13 catalog them?

14 MR. O'HARA: Yes.

15 MR. NELSON: You know, that's not always the
16 action that's taken when archeological resources are
17 found. In the case of Crissy Field, I know that shell
18 mitten (PHONETIC) was basically left in place. It was
19 noticed and marked on a map, and it was essentially, you
20 can't dig in this area. This is a sacred site, etc. So
21 I don't think necessarily that that would be a
22 consideration, but I can't speak to the power of the
23 that finding and what it would mean for Landfill E.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it would depend very
25 much on what the finding was and where it was, and if

1 Crissy Field, the likelihood of people living -- the
2 first people living on the banks -- is greater. What
3 we have neglected is that they haven't done an
4 archeological survey of the whole of the Presidio,
5 because we know it's over 1,480 acres.

6 MR. NELSON: I'll take you back to this slide.
7 I mentioned the internal process that we go through when
8 we -- any of the investigations that I've been involved
9 in, which has been quite a few, since I got here in June
10 of '99 -- we have to go through what we call N squared.
11 N squared is an internal process the Trust goes through
12 to check itself to make sure it's not going to be
13 violating the National Environmental Policy Act, and
14 also the National Historic Preservation Act, as well as
15 ARPO, which is the Archeological Resource Protection
16 Act, and I think also one other -- AHPA is the
17 Archeological and Historic Preservation Act.

18 So every time we've going through a landfill
19 excavation or exploration project, we've had project
20 stipulations or conditions that say you will have an
21 archeological monitor. You will basically preserve any
22 artifacts, if they come up, in the absence of the
23 archeologist, etc. So I think we have checks and
24 balances in place to make sure that if anything is
25 discovered, they're not going to be destroyed. I don't

1 it's something that could be damaged or otherwise harmed
2 by removal of the landfill, that would certainly weigh
3 into the thinking.

4 MS. TRIGIANI: Is there a process though that
5 addresses that? For example, somebody's working there,
6 and they come across something. He or she has to report
7 it, and then the Trust has a process --

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: And as Chris was saying, if
9 there was a discovery during the investigation, there
10 would certainly be a reporting through the archeologist,
11 and depending on the exact nature of the discovery, it
12 might be immediate. Most of the borings here are
13 actually not into the native soil. They're into what we
14 call the historic layer. You would not have prehistoric
15 or Native American artifacts generally in the waste area
16 itself.

17 But if there was something uncovered in the few
18 borings that went through the waste into the native
19 materials, that would be reported out promptly, if not
20 immediately, and would be assessed as to whether that
21 would impact the next round of borings. It might even
22 be the next day's borings. It might be reconsidered to
23 make sure that there wasn't any inadvertent damage. If
24 it was still appropriate to continue investigation, it
25 might be that there would be a heightened sense of

1 monitoring, maybe different folks called in to do
2 monitoring who are more appropriately attuned to the
3 issues at hand.

4 MR. O'HARA: Brian, is there a protocol in
5 place to address those issues?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yes. That's what Chris was
7 talking about, the internal review. This project will
8 undoubtedly get a condition of the level of monitoring
9 that will be required, as well as the Park Service will
10 have archaeologists who are on staff who are available
11 either on a call-out basis, or in some cases, if there
12 is a determined area of concern, full time during the
13 work.

14 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

15 MR. NELSON: Does that answer your question
16 ma'am? And also I should note the best way to look at
17 archeological resources in this type of investigation
18 would be through trenching because you could uncover a
19 lot more. However, these trenches are not going to go
20 anywhere near the bottom of the landfill in most cases
21 because the landfill is quite deep, and the trenches are
22 only going to be somewhere between 12 and 15 feet deep.
23 So in deeper areas where you might have the bottom of
24 the landfill at its deepest point in the center where
25 that there might have been some archeological artifacts,

1 they could only come up through the drilling of the
2 piezometers or the soil borings or the monitoring wells,
3 which I guess would perhaps lessen the amount of
4 material that would come up just through the sheer size.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: You could see a charcoal
6 layer which might have been indicative of habitation,
7 and something like that would certainly be reported and
8 noted.

9 MS. TRIGIANI: Thank you.

10 MR. BERMAN: I had a comment and a question.
11 I think given the state of knowledge that we had a year
12 ago about Landfill E and when the original capping was
13 proposed, I think this is really a tremendous step
14 forward in gathering information. And I think the Trust
15 is to be commended. They took on this task and really
16 tried to gather a lot of information to make a much more
17 informed decision. And I think many of us are very
18 pleased that you've undertaken this and so
19 conscientiously and have developed a really
20 comprehensive plan. Because it looks like all these
21 issues that everyone is talking about, you've touched
22 on. It looks extremely responsive to the concerns that
23 were brought up.

24 I wonder do you have any estimation of what the
25 cost of the investigation is going to be?

1 MR. NELSON: Actually, I do. The
2 investigation cost, as well as the work that's been done
3 to date and the follow-up reports, if we go draft and
4 final, is somewhere on the order of \$400,000. In terms
5 of what's been done in the past, since I've been here
6 managing the Feasibility Study, a very significant
7 investigation cost. And what we're hoping is, this
8 information is not just going to tell us what's in the
9 dirt and what's in the water; it's going to help us
10 further refine all sorts of things related to the
11 Feasibility Study and possibly help us with design. The
12 idea was to try and capture as many balls that are in
13 the air as possible.

14 It's not insignificant what we're doing, and I
15 thank you very much for commending us. But you guys are
16 also to be commended because you all played a part in
17 this. It's a collaborative effort in putting this
18 together.

19 If no one else has any more questions, thank you
20 very much. I'm going to turn the floor over to Craig
21 Cooper.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: So we have another report by
23 Craig Cooper of the Presidio Trust, and this is a
24 project status of the ongoing projects at the Presidio.

25 MR. COOPER: My name is Craig Cooper. I work

1 for the Presidio Trust with Chris Nelson. I'm going to
2 give just a general overview.

3 In addition to Landfill E, we have a lot of other
4 not only hazardous substance sites, what we call CERCLA
5 sites, but we have petroleum cleanup sites, and we have
6 lead-based paint and soil cleanup sites. I'll give you
7 a general overview of the progress we've been making on
8 those sites over the last couple of weeks.

9 But before I get into that, I'll talk a little bit
10 about the recent controversy in the newspapers. This
11 slide should actually be called the "alleged toxic
12 barrel dumping." I think everyone was fully aware a
13 couple of weeks ago the San Francisco Chronicle ran an
14 article based on some allegations made by former Trust
15 employees that perhaps some barrels of toxic waste was
16 buried in the Presidio off Battery Caulfield Road, which
17 is, if you're familiar, it's over behind the Public
18 Health Hospital on that side of the Presidio.

19 Before I jump into it, does anyone have any
20 questions? I can tell you a brief chronology from my
21 experience. I was the point-of-contact person for the
22 Presidio Trust on this particular issue, so I'll just
23 talk about what my experience was and just answer
24 questions, and then we'll jump into our real remediation
25 projects.

1 The day the article ran, that was on a Monday, we
2 met and we decided that we definitely want to take these
3 allegations very seriously. These are very serious
4 allegations if it was true that toxic materials was
5 buried in drums at the Presidio.

6 And to take it seriously, what we didn't want to do
7 was have to end up investigating ourselves, because no
8 matter what kind of thorough, internal investigation you
9 do, when you're accused of something, especially as
10 serious as this, there could always be somebody
11 questioning or some suspicion or something.

12 So what we decided to do was immediately call upon
13 the proper authorities to look into this matter. So I
14 personally called up the EPA, DTSC, Bob's agency, and we
15 also contacted the FBI because of the criminal nature
16 involved in these allegations. And we basically asked
17 them are you interested in conducting an investigation
18 of this? And I think pretty much by later on on that
19 same day, we got a call back from EPA -- or it could
20 have been by the next day -- that they were indeed
21 already -- just based on the newspaper article itself --
22 that they were interested in investigating this issue.
23 So EPA actually coordinated with Bob Bogg's agency,
24 DTSC. And so it was a combined EPA/State of California
25 investigation into this.

1 The lead, though, was EPA's criminal investigation
2 division. Because of the nature of this particular
3 allegation, it was basically an environmental crime. So
4 it was basically considered a crime scene.

5 So my understanding is the EPA folks took it from
6 there. We at the Presidio Trust told them that they
7 would have our full cooperation; any information that
8 they needed we would turn over to them. And we wrote a
9 letter to EPA saying that they had full access to the
10 Presidio, to conduct any type of investigation, to bring
11 any witness into the Presidio to help get to the truth
12 of this matter. We wrote them letters to that effect.
13 So what the EPA folks did completely on their own was
14 they contacted the individuals that made these
15 allegations in the letter, and interviewed many of them.
16 And they also interviewed some other folks that came
17 forward kind of on their own, above and beyond the
18 people that actually wrote the letter. And so that
19 happened over a course of maybe five to seven working
20 days. So the whole week when the article ran -- and
21 then last week, Wednesday, I got a call from EPA. They
22 said, "We're ready. We have a specific location that
23 based on information that we've received from these
24 witnesses, there is a specific location that we want to
25 dig into and investigate." So that happened last week

1 Wednesday. And on Wednesday afternoon, the EPA folks
2 asked if we had heavy equipment that we could use and an
3 operator to use. So basically EPA supervised this
4 investigation, and we had a Presidio Trust backhoe and
5 frontloader with a Presidio Trust operator that operated
6 that, but at the direction of the EPA and DTSC
7 officials. That's what happened on August 8, last week
8 Thursday.

9 The investigation happened at what we call -- it
10 happens to be one of our hazardous substances
11 investigation sites under our CERCLA program -- the Nike
12 site, where there was three former Nike Missile
13 magazines. But it's also an area that we at the
14 Presidio Trust and the National Park Service use as a
15 staging area, where soil is brought from different parts
16 of the Presidio and put their clean soil that's puts
17 there. For example, if we do a planting at Crissy Field
18 or whatever, and we might want to remove some of the
19 soil there, and we'll dig that soil out and just stage
20 it temporarily there at the Nike facility. It's a big
21 flat, broad area where we use to stage soil.

22 So when I showed up, I didn't know at all where EPA
23 wanted to dig. They basically told me what type of
24 heavy equipment they needed and what time that we should
25 show up, basically. When we showed up, the EPA folks

1 took me and the equipment operator to this particular
2 soil stockpile and said, "This is where we want to dig
3 out."

4 And we said, "Not a problem."

5 So the operator started removing soil away, and
6 basically stockpiling it on a temporary basis on a pad.
7 They just dug in and dug in and got down until a
8 particular -- so this is approximate right here. It's
9 right in here.

10 So there's several soil stockpiles there at the
11 Nike facility, but there was only one in particular that
12 the EPA folks were interested in, and that one basically
13 was removed, and they were thinking that maybe the drums
14 were hiding inside the soil stockpile, and there was no
15 drums found inside. Once we got down to the native
16 soils, they instructed the backhoe operator to dig a
17 trench down the middle of that. So I would say it was
18 an area that was first, this little stockpile that was
19 moved (INAUDIBLE) in areas encased by this table there.

20 So you just kind of imagine this soil stockpile
21 about this size and about my height that was removed.
22 And then once that was removed, then it was kind-of a
23 flat area, and then down the middle of that flat area a
24 trench about this deep (INDICATING) was dug. And that
25 was it. And the whole time the EPA investigators had to

Page 61

1 have a contractor there with them that had a hand-held
2 magnetometer which can shoot down a remote sensing
3 device, and every time before digging into a soil
4 stockpile occurred or any trenching occurred, they would
5 put the device down there to check to see if there was
6 any buried metal.

7 So if the magnetometer needle would move, that
8 would mean there was buried metal. But the magnetometer
9 never picked up any buried metal devices. After that
10 trench was done, the EPA folks said that we are
11 satisfied that there isn't any drums at this particular
12 location.

13 MR. ANDERSON: The allegation was that this
14 had occurred a couple of years ago? And so it would
15 have been before you would have piled the material?
16 Would that have been before you piled the material?

17 MR. COOPER: I think that soil stockpiling was
18 occurring there for -- it was while we were using it as
19 a soil stockpiling.

20 MR. O'HARA: I'm curious to find out how you
21 learned of this issue, and why the congressional
22 representatives acted the way they did, as opposed to
23 contacting you either by phone or as opposed to sending
24 a letter, which was obviously a leak to the press. And
25 I don't quite understand why our congressional

Page 62

1 representatives acted in the way they did, which turned
2 out to be a huge embarrassment obviously to them as a
3 result. But how did you learn of this?

4 MR. COOPER: So the article was written on a
5 Monday. The previous Friday it's my understanding the
6 congressman actually faxed over a letter, attached the
7 former employees' letter, and put a cover letter on top
8 of it and faxed it over to Craig Middleton on just the
9 previous Friday and said, "You need to look into this.
10 These are serious allegations. Get back to me," and
11 they put in some kind of deadline. I wasn't even
12 working on that Friday before, and I think Craig
13 Middleton called over to George Ford on 5:00 o'clock on
14 a Friday saying, "Hey. We're faxing over a letter. You
15 better take a look at this." And obviously that
16 letter -- I don't know who gave it to the Chronicle. I
17 don't know the story behind that, who gave it to the
18 Chronicle.

19 MR. BERMAN: The job description for a
20 congress person doesn't require any etiquette or a
21 reasonable policy, and anything that's newsworthy that a
22 congress person sees often is just indiscriminately
23 handled.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: It's a big labor issue, don't
25 you think? These are disgruntled ex-employees. So if

Page 63

1 they go to the congress people who have big labor
2 connections, then those congress people literally have
3 to respond, or else they're displeasing a major
4 constituency. So in their defense, as specious as it
5 is, that's probably why they had to do it.

6 MR. O'HARA: I've been a member of this board
7 since it was started. I am absolutely outraged at the
8 way this has been handled, the embarrassment that it has
9 brought to the Trust, its employees, the regulators,
10 because there is an implication that there has been
11 malfeasance perpetrated with the knowledge of the Trust,
12 the Park Service, the other stakeholders, the
13 regulators. It has done, from what I believe,
14 irreparable damage to the integrity of the organizations
15 that are making an attempt to clean this place up.

16 MS. TRIGIANI: I'm totally with you on this.
17 As a resident here, I see this as an opportunity in the
18 way Mr. Middleton and the Trust handled the allegation,
19 and within ten days they had an answer one way or the
20 other. They weren't taking ownership of that answer.
21 They weren't trying to direct the outcome. It was
22 handled with the utmost integrity. And if anybody
23 should be embarrassed, it's the people who felt that
24 they had to please a major constituency who was
25 (INAUDIBLE) for some other reason.

Page 64

1 MR. O'HARA: I agree with you, but the damage
2 to the institution has already been done. Fortunately,
3 nothing was found. But they had to prove their
4 innocence, and that's what I take umbrage with.

5 MS. TRIGIANI: You can't control --

6 MR. O'HARA: It's also a labor issue. I
7 agree, but we're getting way off the point.

8 MR. COOPER: The labor issue is something way
9 out of the purview of this Board. For the environmental
10 issue, I think it's important that if an allegation like
11 this was made, and the EPA folks and experts -- they get
12 calls like this, "Hey, this is buried." They are
13 experts in parsing out what's a credible story and what
14 isn't.

15 So based on their interviews of these folks, they
16 felt there was at least enough credibility behind these
17 allegations to check this out. From an environmental
18 perspective, I'm glad we had the experts take a look at
19 it so we could get some closure and get to the truth of
20 it.

21 MR. SUTTER: Over the years, has the Army or
22 the Trust, to your knowledge, sunk any fuel tanks or
23 anything in this general area? What I'm wondering is if
24 maybe an underground fuel tank was installed there at
25 some time in the past, and that that may have been the

Page 65

1 seed that generated these allegations.

2 MR. COOPER: No. I'm not aware of any tanks.

3 MR. SUTTER: The final newspaper article said
4 the EPA has determined that after they had done the
5 trenching, that this area had not previously been
6 disturbed.

7 MR. COOPER: Exactly.

8 MR. SUTTER: Nothing had ever occurred there
9 in the past.

10 MR. COOPER: In fact, after we removed the
11 soil stockpile and EPA folks looked at -- they did some
12 preliminary testing, the native soil underneath looked
13 completely undisturbed. They did the trench just to be
14 extra careful, you know.

15 MR. BOGGS: Just to add a little bit to
16 Peter's concern. My management has expressed concern as
17 well. It's not the senator's job to be following up on
18 hazardous waste allegations. That is our job. They are
19 contemplating a letter to those senators. We do
20 regularly get referrals. Normally it is something where
21 it gets referred. The normal channel wouldn't be to go
22 through the San Francisco Chronicle. So my management
23 is also concerned. I don't what if any action they are
24 going to take. It may just be a side conversation
25 saying, "Don't do that anymore. Call us instead." But

Page 66

1 there are people that share your concern, and hopefully
2 that correction will be put in in the future. We don't
3 want to stop people from reporting or telling people
4 what they think is an illegal dumping. We don't want to
5 disturb that kind of disclosure. But we do want to
6 discourage it from being a media hype, as opposed to
7 dealing with it properly.

8 MR. COOPER: These folks could have gone to
9 DTSC or EPA directly.

10 MR. HULTGREN: Are any charges considered
11 against the ones who signed that letter?

12 MR. COOPER: All I can say from last week
13 Thursday, that was a very common question asked by the
14 reporters. Oh, by the way, when we finished all the
15 trenching, we invited the entire media crew down to the
16 site because there an exclusion zone while the
17 investigation was going on for the public. And they
18 came down and took photographs of the excavated area.
19 And the way the EPA folks answered that is that at this
20 point they're not contemplating any charges, but they're
21 going to talk to the US Attorney about that. I think
22 it's a pretty high threshold the way one EKI guy -- you
23 have to prove that the people were knowingly lying in
24 their letter. It's a very high threshold to prove. So
25 it's basically being referred to the US attorney and

Page 67

1 they'll make some calls. I don't know.

2 MR. SUTTER: Do they consider this allegation
3 a closed issue now?

4 MR. COOPER: Yes.

5 MR. SUTTER: What if some of these letter
6 writers say, "Oh, no. That wasn't the right area. It's
7 really over here."

8 MR. COOPER: Right. That question was also
9 asked. My memory of how EPA answered that question was
10 with respect to the allegations that were made in the
11 original letter and the interviews that they made of
12 those seven people and the new people regarding that
13 particular allegation, it's case closed. Of course, any
14 regulatory agency has to be open to new information.

15 So if the original seven say, "You looked in the
16 wrong place," even though we asked them where to look,
17 or EPA asked them where to look, or let's say somebody
18 completely new steps in and says, "It wasn't at Nike.
19 It was someplace else," that is new information, and I
20 think the experts would have to start from scratch and
21 take a look at the credibility of the information and
22 take every allegation seriously and go from there.

23 MR. HULTGREN: Is it correct that no one knows
24 how it was leaked to the newspapers?

25 MR. COOPER: I don't know.

Page 68

1 MS. TRIGIANI: They probably walked the letter
2 into the Chronicle office I'm sure is what happened.
3 That's beyond a leak. I can't imagine that congress
4 people would do that.

5 MR. BERMAN: Who actually covered the cost of
6 this?

7 MR. COOPER: We all kind of paid our own cost
8 for the most part. You mean like for the backhoe
9 operator, the heavy equipment? The Presidio Trust
10 provided that at no cost to EPA. And EPA and DTSC's
11 time to investigate, to conduct all the interviews and
12 come out and conduct this investigation, that was done
13 at their own cost. I don't think they will be sending
14 us a bill.

15 My sympathies go to the people -- there is some
16 homes, as you know, that are very close to the Nike
17 facility. People that live there -- we at the Trust did
18 send a letter to the folks shortly after the articles
19 were written, saying that we've turned this case over to
20 EPA. Here's the phone number. Because you live nearby,
21 if you happen to have seen anything, here's the number
22 of EPA to call. You can call me. I'm sure that those
23 people that lived near there were probably wondering,
24 "Wow. What does this mean to mean me?" There was
25 probably a week or two where they were pretty concerned.

1 Hopefully, they're feeling a lot better now.
 2 Okay. Any other questions on this issue? All
 3 right. So Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. As you know, we
 4 closed our public comment period on that. And for the
 5 new folks, these two hazardous substance sites, our two
 6 landfills over on the Coastal Bluffs area -- not on the
 7 bluffs themselves but near that area, kind of near
 8 Central Magazine, near the World War II memorial, just
 9 above that -- the Presidio Trust is recommending full
 10 excavation of both of these sites, dig out all the waste
 11 all the contaminated soil. That was our recommended
 12 remedy.

13 We got comments from the public, and during the
 14 public comment period, some of the comments were in
 15 favor of the recommended remedy; some of the comments
 16 were opposed to the recommended remedy. And so what we
 17 at the Trust had to do is we write this document called
 18 a Responsiveness Summary. So you write down every
 19 comment that was submitted, either in writing or orally
 20 during the public meetings, and you put down what the
 21 comment was, and then what our response is.

22 Just for your information, the Presidio Trust is
 23 still recommending full excavation of both of these
 24 sites. But what we've done now is we've sent our
 25 response to comments to Bob and to Jim, a draft of that.

1 And so those two agencies are looking at that particular
 2 document and deciding whether the Trust is responding to
 3 the comments in an appropriate way. And so once I hear
 4 back from them, and we'll decide whether to stick with
 5 the recommended remedy or change our mind.

6 MR. SUTTER: What was the nature of the
 7 negative comments?

8 MR. COOPER: The nature in general kind of
 9 sounded on several themes. Number one, primarily the
 10 people opposed were opposed to excavation of Fill Site
 11 5. They didn't seem to be opposed -- they were okay
 12 with excavation of Landfill 4. But they felt at Fill
 13 Site 5, for the amount of contamination there, that
 14 capping would be a better remedy. It would be more cost
 15 effective, better use of the remediation funds. So they
 16 were in favor of the capping remedy for Fill Site 5.

17 MR. SUTTER: So it was basically economic.

18 MR. COOPER: Primarily an economic one. They
 19 brought up several issues, but to nutshell it, it pretty
 20 much focused on that one.

21 Okay. So, no change on that. If we do, I think we
 22 talked about the process before, so I won't bother to
 23 comment on that.

24 Okay. Another document that we're working on is
 25 this RAW. It stands for Removal Action Work Plan, or

1 Contingency Plan, and that is a document that we've put
 2 before you all before. That is a document that puts up
 3 the requirements for -- if the Trust is putting in a
 4 pipeline or putting in an irrigation line or something
 5 like that, and if we run into some contaminated soil,
 6 what do we do? We are recommending that we would dig it
 7 up and clean up that contaminated area to our cleanup
 8 levels and haul it away. So that's what this Removal
 9 Action Work Plan is for -- future undiscovered
 10 contamination.

11 So that document is reaching the final stages. We
 12 have not started the public comment period yet. We've
 13 been wanting to start it. DTSC is working out some
 14 last-minute issues on that, and so Bob, you might want
 15 to speak for a minute on that issue.

16 MR. BOGGS: Yes. Basically we've run into --
 17 we have an office that handles CEQA issues, the
 18 California Environmental Quality Act. And it says that
 19 any projects have to go through a CEQA review. When our
 20 people reviewed the CEQA documentation for this RAW,
 21 they said, "Well, we don't know the nature and extent of
 22 the contamination because it's an unknown site. So we
 23 can't project all the potential environmental impacts
 24 that this thing could have." So they say -- generally
 25 in the CEQA process, we look at a project and do what's

1 called an Initial Study. It's kind of a check list of
 2 going over all the potential environmental impacts:
 3 traffic, anesthetics, noise, dust, you name it. And if
 4 there is a potential impact -- if we can't say, "less
 5 than significant impact," and check that box on all of
 6 these categories, it means that we have to do an
 7 environmental impact report and study it in more detail.

8 Our position is that in this initial study if you
 9 can check, "No significant impacts everywhere," then you
 10 do what's called a Negative Declaration as opposed to an
 11 Environment Impact Report. A Negative Dec says this is
 12 not going to have bad impacts on the environment. So
 13 we're thinking, "Gee. We're just going to dig up small
 14 areas of contamination, limit it to 2,000 cubic yards
 15 and clean it up to clean-closure cleanup levels. That
 16 is a good thing for the environment; therefore, it
 17 should constitute a Negative Dec.

18 People in our CEQA office say, "Well, we can't
 19 evaluate all the impacts because we don't know if you're
 20 cleaning up bubble gum or something nobody's ever heard
 21 of. So until we can know all of those things, you have
 22 to do a more aggressive study and do an Environmental
 23 Impact Report. Well, that would cause some very
 24 significant delays. So then our management got
 25 involved; attorneys got involved, and now our chief

Page 73

1 counsel is involved. And so it immediately has gotten
2 taken all the way up. It actually has a lot of impacts
3 to all the other military bases that are being cleaned
4 up as well. So we've got a conference call tomorrow,
5 and hopefully the legal issues regarding this can get
6 worked out, and we can get moving forward on it.

7 MR. COOPER: Keep your fingers crossed on that
8 one.

9 MR. BERMAN: Bob, is there a particular
10 contaminant that is driving this, or is this just across
11 the board?

12 MR. BOGGS: It's just across the board. As
13 part of this plan, we did say there are certain types of
14 contamination that would not be eligible for cleanup
15 under this plan: radiological, unexploded bombs,
16 chemical warfare agents -- all that kind of stuff
17 wouldn't be eligible for cleanup under this plan. It's
18 not that any one contaminant stuck out. It's that we
19 don't know what we could find. One teaspoonful could
20 have some big environment impact. We also don't know
21 where we might find one teaspoonful, whether it's next
22 to an endangered species or not. To predict all the
23 environmental impacts just in an initial study, our
24 people don't think that they can make that jump. So
25 that's why the lawyers are involved, to see whether they

Page 75

1 contingency is for when they do a project, for example,
2 a trenching project that they're going to put in
3 sprinklers, they attach to their NEPA/CEQA documentation
4 a Soil Management Plan, and that Soil Management Plan is
5 essentially like this Contingency RAW. So then it gets
6 carried through as part of this, immediately it doesn't
7 then require -- but also when you're doing this little
8 project of trenching, we know that our site is this big,
9 bounded by this, and we can make some assessment of what
10 (INAUDIBLE) in that one building area or hundred square
11 yard area as opposed to the whole Presidio in general.

12 MR. COOPER: Okay. So hopefully, if tomorrow's
13 conference call goes well, we can get things going and
14 get the public comment period started and have a public
15 meeting in September.

16 Other stuff going on. The Public Health Service
17 Hospital. We have a Work Plan, a Five Year Review Work
18 Plan that's undergoing regulatory agency review. In
19 fact, we met with Jim and Bob about that today. We were
20 going to do a full presentation on that, but they had
21 some pretty important comments on that, so we're going
22 to revise that particular document. And once it gets
23 revised, and we get the regulatory agencies' kind of nod
24 like you're going more in the right direction, then
25 we'll probably do a full presentation for the RAB. It

Page 74

1 feel comfortable making that declaration or not.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there a kind of a compromise
3 we can make here? That is, not to get complete
4 approval, but to have sort of a CEQA contingency in the
5 Contingency Plan, so that you could deal with this?
6 Because if you found a jar of Hexachromium 6 in there,
7 you might be really concerned. But then in general, it
8 looks to me like you could do a cursory examination and
9 make sure that nothing of extreme toxicity is there.

10 MR. BOGGS: Well, that actually is part of the
11 plan, part of how we would evaluate a discovery if they
12 happened upon something. But to guess everything that
13 the Army ever could have potentially used at, for
14 example, LAIR -- in fact, there is some old reports that
15 Brian even supplied me, and there's a list of stuff,
16 lists and lists and lists of all kinds of stuff. And to
17 evaluate the potential impact of all those environmental
18 things, again turns it into this big document, when all
19 we want to do is dig up contaminated dirt.

20 Also in this plan, if it affects the groundwater,
21 that site is not eligible for cleanup under this plan.
22 So we're trying to limit the size of sites, the type of
23 sites that can be eligible under this. So hopefully
24 then we can bracket what the potential impacts are.

25 An alternate method, a contingency for this

Page 76

1 is publicly available right now. It's at the library,
2 if you want to take a look at the current version.

3 All right. Groundwater monitoring keeps on
4 happening. No real change there. Check to see the
5 status of how reports are being issued on that.

6 In our Petroleum Program, over the last couple of
7 months, we've removed a whole bunch of tanks from the
8 coastal batteries, a couple things from the Portola
9 housing and so on. And reports regarding those tank
10 removals are in progress.

11 If folks are really interested, at the last RAB
12 committee meeting, George Ford did a presentation of
13 tank removals of those coastal batteries, and we have
14 some nice pictures presenting that. So we can do that
15 if you're interested.

16 So in addition, also an important, very important
17 part of our Petroleum Program is our Corrective Action
18 Site. That's where we have widespread petroleum
19 contamination in soil and/or groundwater. And those
20 investigations are on the way. The Commissary/PX
21 investigation, the first round, we actually finished.
22 The regulatory agencies approved that work plan. That
23 just finished on August 6. The next one that's going on
24 right now is 1065. That work plan has been approved by
25 the regulatory agencies. We started out with some

1 MR. COOPER: We've prepared that table. We're
 2 preparing that table that shows each of our remediation
 3 sites, what our budget is, and then our cost to date and
 4 so on.
 5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Would that be ready for the
 6 next RAB meeting?
 7 MR. COOPER: Two RAB meetings. We shouldn't
 8 let it slide too far.
 9 MR. SUTTER: I had a question on the process
 10 as well. Back in June, I had spoken to George on the
 11 phone, and he was mentioning that you guys were going to
 12 be going ahead with an RFP?
 13 MR. COOPER: Yes. Right. We have got two
 14 bids in. We've talked to Albert Chan, our contracting
 15 officer. There's one particular scheduler that we want
 16 to hire. So now it's just a matter of paperwork to
 17 bring that scheduler aboard because we have a deadline
 18 with DTSC of October 5 to get a good-looking schedule in
 19 no later than that. We're doing everything we can to
 20 meet that.
 21 MR. SUTTER: (INAUDIBLE) you will provide a
 22 dedicated scheduler.
 23 MR. COOPER: Yes. It's going to be a
 24 contractor. They're not going to be full-time, but
 25 we're going to have a little work space set up for them

1 right there in 1750, you know, right where Denise sits?
 2 Right across the street. There will be a computer there
 3 for the scheduler so that they can interact with each of
 4 the project managers on a real-time basis, and maybe
 5 come in obviously a lot more often early on to get the
 6 schedule in good shape. And then there will be routine
 7 schedule updates where they'll come in and work on the
 8 schedule.
 9 MR. SUTTER: Congratulations.
 10 MR. COOPER: We tried to do it ourselves, and
 11 it didn't work out for us. We got in over our heads on
 12 a very large schedule. We thought we could do it
 13 ourselves with our own staff. Hiring schedulers is
 14 really common in large projects, we've found out. It's
 15 not any big deal. So we've contracted it out.
 16 MR. YOUNGKIN: Item No. 9. If you have any
 17 agenda items for the upcoming RAB meeting or committee
 18 meeting, please forward them to myself or Craig. Any
 19 other announcements or anybody from the public want to
 20 make a comment?
 21 MS. TRIGIANI: Question. What does DTSC stand
 22 for? And what does RWQCB stand for?
 23 MR. BOGGS: DTSC is the California Department
 24 of Toxic Substances Control.
 25 MS. TRIGIANI: California, that's the state.

1 MR. BOGGS: State of California.
 2 MS. TRIGIANI: Got it.
 3 MR. PONTON: RWQCB is another state agency.
 4 Regional Water Quality Control Board.
 5 MR. COOPER: They are basically our two state
 6 regulators. So all of the work plans, we have to get
 7 their permission, basically. As the remediation process
 8 goes forward, we get their approval. They are our
 9 regulatory oversight.
 10 MS. TRIGIANI: And you don't have any federal?
 11 Do you have federal requirements as well?
 12 MR. COOPER: We have to comply with federal
 13 environmental laws, but the Federal EPA was at one time
 14 involved as far as doing regulatory oversight, but they
 15 decided to basically turn it over to the state. They
 16 could get reinvolved at any point in time that they
 17 wished. But they've stepped back and they're letting
 18 the state agencies do it right now.
 19 MS. TRIGIANI: Probably got it covered.
 20 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other questions or
 21 comments, announcements?
 22 MR. SUTTER: I just have one comment as a RAB
 23 member. Commenting on Peter's concern about the toxic
 24 waste allegations. I just want to say for the record
 25 that I think the Trust handled that situation in an

1 excellent way. The Trust should be commended with
 2 fairness by calling in an outside agency to do an
 3 independent, objective investigation.
 4 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Without objection,
 5 meeting adjourned.
 6 (The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.)
 7 ---oOo---

Page 77

1 geophysical surveys this week, and we'll actually start
2 drilling and taking environmental samples next week.
3 This particular Corrective Action Site coming up next,
4 the 1349. That's the next one we're looking forward to
5 get comments on. And this one is in fourth place here.
6 That is still undergoing internal review with the Trust
7 and the Park Service. Okay.

8 So our next CERCLA decision document is going to be
9 a RAP. So we have a RAP for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5,
10 and then a RAW for contingency sites. Now the next
11 CERCLA decision document is going to be a RAP for the
12 Baker Beach area, Disturbed Area 3, 4, and Fill Site 6.
13 That's still in progress undergoing internal review.

14 Not much to say about that.

15 As you know, when we knocked down the Letterman
16 Hospital and the LAIR facility, we had a compete sample
17 plan associated with that. We took a whole bunch of
18 environmental samples, and that report, a revised
19 version of that report, has been submitted to DTSC and
20 the Regional Board.

21 Mountain Lake. No news on that, really.

22 MR. BOGGS: (INAUDIBLE) respond from Caltrans.
23 My attorneys haven't followed up with their response to
24 CalTrans.

25 MR. SUTTER: Who has got more attorneys?

Page 79

1 is done. We're writing a completion report for that
2 particular cleanup. And Fill Site 7/900, we're writing
3 the completion report for all the groundwater monitoring
4 we've been doing in that area. When those two things
5 are done, then we can write a mega completion report for
6 the entire Crissy Field Operable Unit. Crissy Field
7 Operable unit is really in the winding-down stages now.
8 It's a lot of getting all the paperwork in place,
9 getting the regulatory close-out. As is the case of the
10 DEH Operable Unit, the closure report for that one is to
11 be written. That's it.

12 It's late already. I'm probably not going to do
13 pictures of the tank removal. I just want to make sure
14 that everyone got this handout.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Let's move on to Item No. 6.
16 The Regulatory Agency Status Updates/Input. We'll start
17 off by asking Bob Boggs from DTSC if he has a report for
18 us.

19 MR. BOGGS: Nothing to add. I think we've
20 touched on most of the hot issues. That's it for me.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you Bob. Jim, any
22 announcements for us?

23 MR. PONTON: First, I'd like to introduce my
24 boss and supervisor John Kaiser. Maybe John would like
25 do say something. Other than that, I've just been doing

Page 78

1 Caltrans, obviously.

2 MR. O'HARA: Bob, didn't they basically just
3 blow you off?

4 MR. BOGGS: Yeah. And our attorneys have had
5 several conversations. We don't agree with all of what
6 they've said. So somewhere in the piles of things for
7 Isabela to do is this letter to Mountain Lake. I just
8 need to keep reminding her that this is a higher
9 priority.

10 MR. NELSON: But on a lighter note, there is
11 continuing restoration work going on out there. The
12 sediment removal has been put off for the time being,
13 but they're continuing to move forward with other
14 aspects of the planning process. They're working on an
15 overlook at the East Arm, I guess. And they've also
16 removed a number of eucalyptus trees and replanted the
17 area with native plants. It's quite nice. So it's
18 really looking really nice out there. We're just
19 waiting for the remediation part to catch up, I guess.

20 MR. COOPER: Here's a list of recent
21 lead-based paints and soils clean up we've done that are
22 in progress or that we're set to do. Also there's
23 another decision document plan that we're working on
24 right now that is coming out very soon.

25 Crissy Field. As you know, the skeet range cleanup

Page 80

1 a lot of reports, as you can see. We've been having
2 meetings and moving the process forward.

3 MR. KAISER: Well, I've been in the program
4 now for about five weeks. And I'm managed to attend
5 probably as many RAB meetings to this point. The one
6 thing that impresses me is essentially the participation
7 of the community members. And I know I'm sitting in
8 here tonight. Well, I heard a lot of good questions I
9 think any good geologist would ask. I don't know if all
10 the people that asked the questions are geologists.
11 They kind of hit it right in the line. I appreciate
12 being here.

13 MR. NELSON: How do the non-geologists answer
14 that?

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. Moving right along.
16 New business and recently released documents. I know
17 there's a few documents out because I got an E-mail from
18 notification of them. So check your E-mails.

19 MR. NELSON: Right.

20 MR. BERMAN: Two new documents came out today.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: New business? Anybody? Review
22 of action items. I'm not sure if we had any action
23 items.

24 MR. BERMAN: There was still something left
25 from financial reporting.

RAB MEMBERS

- 1
- 2 Sam Berman
- 3 Bob Boggs, DTSC
- 4 Edward Callahan
- 5 Craig Cooper
- 6 Dennis Downing
- 7 Julian Hultgren
- 8 Jan Monaghan
- 9 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
- 10 Peter O'Hara
- 11 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
- 12 David Sutter
- 13 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
- 14 Tracy Wright
- 15 Gloria Yaros
- 16 Mark Youngkin
- 17
- 18 Others Present:
- 19 Espanola Jackson
- 20 Francisco DeCosta
- 21 Jan Blum
- 22 Mary Trigiani
- 23 ---oOo--
- 24
- 25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

SEPTEMBER 10, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

COPY

Page 3

1 least 20. You can have a maximum of 30. It doesn't
2 really give a specific number besides that range from 20
3 to 30. So we're below our authorized minimum.

4 MR. COOPER: An update on the membership
5 drive. I think we've got agreement on the add. I've
6 forwarded the adds to layout. I suspect maybe within a
7 week or so that add will get published in about five or
8 six different newspapers in the Bay Area. So hopefully
9 that will generate more interest.

10 MR. SUTTER: How long will the add run?

11 MR. COOPER: One day, unless we never talked
12 about that.

13 MR. SUTTER: Which day?

14 MR. COOPER: Sunday. What's a good day?

15 MR. BERMAN: I think if you talk to people
16 about advertising, they'll tell you one day never works
17 for anything.

18 MR. COOPER: Okay. Do you want to do it two
19 consecutive Sundays?

20 MR. BERMAN: Eight consecutive days. Two
21 Sundays and six days in between. It's the rate for
22 eight days. It's nearly the same as two days.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's for classified.

24 MR. COOPER: This will be a two-by-two or
25 three-by-three add. It's not going to be a tiny thing

Page 2

1 MR. KERN: Welcome everyone to the September
2 Restoration Advisory Board meeting, etc. Welcome
3 everyone. Welcome to the this evening. Our members of
4 the community people that are here, welcome. And to the
5 Board members and to our regulatory members, thanks for
6 being here, and the Park Service. Are there any changes
7 or additions to the agenda tonight? Announcements or
8 old business? Committee reports.

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Doug. We had our
10 regular monthly planning committee meeting on
11 August 27th. That's the trustees of the month in
12 Building 1750. Our first topic we discussed was the
13 Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 Responsiveness Summary and Final
14 RAB. And the business specs we went over, the whole
15 package. We discussed the Landfill E Sampling plan.
16 We discussed membership. We have two new applications
17 for membership. We have some action items on membership
18 review. Some question on the wording on that. On the
19 last paragraph. We worked on the RAB add for the
20 newspapers. We're working on a draft of that.

21 MR. O'HARA: For clarification purposes, how
22 many memberships slots are we authorized? How many are
23 filled, and what is a quorum?

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: We have 14 members now at the
25 last committee meeting. Our bylaws say we maintain at

Page 4

1 in the public notice section.

2 MR. BERMAN: How much are they charging?

3 MR. COOPER: I don't know yet. It's going to
4 layout right now, and then I'll get a price quote. Some
5 papers are really cheap. For example, I think on the
6 Chronicle, for those adds that we put in the paper
7 announcing the public comment period, I think that was a
8 thousand bucks. A day. For one two-by-two add in the
9 Chronicle.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: You can always try and see what
11 kind of response you get and run again.

12 MR. O'HARA: If you're looking for
13 activist-type individuals, would the Chronicle be the
14 best place to go? The Guardian and the Times --
15 something equivalent where the readership is
16 specifically looking for those topics.

17 MR. COOPER: Okay. Yeah. I'm really
18 interested in more neighborhood newspapers. And, for
19 example, we are doing the Bay Guardian and the San
20 Francisco Independent and the Chronicle, the Marin
21 Independent. And it's the Chronicle, both East Bay
22 edition, Peninsula edition and the Marin edition.

23 MR. O'HARA: I think a paper similar to the
24 Marina Times that have a limited circulation. But the
25 people that read the Marina Times read it purposefully

DISK ENCLOSED

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

Page 5

1 or they wrap fish in it. People don't independently
2 pick up the Marina Times to read. It's for purpose or
3 to pitch it.

4 MR. COOPER: That's a very good idea. Okay.
5 That's a good idea.

6 MR. O'HARA: It's weekly or biweekly. I'm not
7 sure.

8 MR. SUTTER: You might also try the Noe Valley
9 Voice. It's a monthly, but it's read widely in Noe
10 Valley and down in the community.

11 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You might want to see
12 if they'll run it on the website and the Presidio Post.

13 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah. The Presidio Post for
14 sure.

15 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You'll get people who
16 are interested, and it's free.

17 MR. COOPER: Our website already has an ending
18 when you click on environmental cleanup. In the
19 spotlight our membership drive is featured encouraging
20 them to click on the link. They can actually download
21 an application from our website. So basically somebody
22 goes to our website. They'll be encouraged to get an
23 application from there.

24 MR. SUTTER: You might consider Spur. Post it
25 on there. But the bulletin, San Francisco Planning and

Page 7

1 circulating the RAP for signature by next week for sure,
2 if not before then. So that will get done. And then as
3 you can tell from the slide, George has been doing some
4 work. (INAUDIBLE) George had a bid walk. Maybe you
5 might want to talk about that.

6 MR. FORD: We had a bid walk on last
7 Wednesday. I guess it would be an understatement to say
8 it was well attended, and there was high bidder
9 interest. I don't think there are too many jobs
10 happening right now, so everybody and their brother
11 showed up for this one.

12 In the past when we've done smaller jobs, we usually
13 have six or eight, maybe ten bidders at a job walk.
14 This is a huge number. I'm hoping for a feeding frenzy
15 among the bidders. We should see some pretty good
16 prices I hope. The one downside of having a big mob of
17 people bidding -- I don't have any statistics to back it
18 up -- but I believe that it increases the possibility
19 that somebody who is really desperate and angry will
20 file a protest and try to overturn the bidding process.
21 We'll deal with that if it happens.

22 MR. BERMAN: What is your cost estimate again?

23 MR. FORD: It depends on which one you look
24 at. The one in the RAP is about 6 million dollars for
25 both of them. I'm expecting and hoping that the actual

Page 6

1 Urban Research Association. Lots of people pass in and
2 out of this place. World Affairs Council in the same
3 building on Sutter Street. I'm sure they'd be glad to
4 post announcements.

5 MR. COOPER: I don't know. Okay. That's
6 where I would expect it to go. That's where our public
7 notices go.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the Chronicle ad reps
9 can tell you. You work with the rep to figure out what
10 would be a well-read section and one that might meet the
11 demographics of potential RAB members.

12 MR. KERN: Anything else on this item? Moving
13 along. 5 A. Over to George for many updates.

14 MR. FORD: Actually we set up our little Power
15 Point in the wrong order. If you don't mind, I'll punt
16 it to Craig. We don't want to make the computer upset.

17 MR. COOPER: Does everyone have the two
18 handouts that was over in at the sign-in table? The
19 First Presidio particulars is the handout called
20 "Project Status Updates"? I'm going to cover the first
21 couple of slides, and then George will kick in.
22 It's still happening -- Landfill 4 and Fill Site cleanup
23 is still scheduled to happen this year. We are in the
24 final stages of getting agency review of the Remedial
25 Action Plan, the RAP, done. I hope to actually start

Page 8

1 bid prices will come in under that, but we'll see. The
2 bids are due negotiation Thursday by 6:00 o'clock. I
3 think we'll have a bid opening at 5:05. We have
4 minority woman-owned business enterprise. We have a
5 participating goal, so that basically a contractor
6 either has to meet the goal or document a good-faith
7 effort to try to meet it. There is enough subcontract
8 work in trucking and surveying and things like that.
9 People should be able to make a pretty good run. I
10 don't know precisely what the percentage is, but we do
11 have one.

12 Albert Chan, who is our contracting officer, is the
13 most meticulous human being I have ever met. The
14 apparent winner is going to be examined very closely to
15 make sure that their bid and their minority participants
16 and everything else are in order. We're keeping our
17 fingers crossed. It's flattering to have all this
18 attention from all these bidders.

19 MR. BERMAN: What fraction of your estimated
20 cost is the actual trucking?

21 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I can't
22 break it out for you, but I can tell you typically on
23 previous jobs, if we spend \$40 a ton for Class 2
24 Disposal, I think most of these landfills will go out as
25 Class 2. I think it's roughly two-thirds disposal fee

Page 9

1 and one-third trucking out of that price. It's
2 somewhere in that ballpark.

3 MR. BERMAN: Of the 6 million, for just the
4 trucking and disposal is 70, 80 percent of it?
5 Restoration and some minor excavation and surveying and
6 things like that?

7 MR. FORD: At least three-quarters of it are
8 in the hauling and disposal. Those two items are by far
9 the largest component.

10 MR. BERMAN: In your RFT, will there be any
11 required set of documentation; write a written report as
12 to what they did and actually --

13 MR. FORD: There's actually a report which
14 will be prepared at the end of the project, and it would
15 be -- the contractor will be responsible for doing some
16 of the components of that report. But what we look to
17 the contractor for is they're required to give us a
18 as-built drawing that show the site as they left it.
19 They have to give us all the hauling and disposal
20 tickets for all the waste, no matter where it went.
21 We'll collect those, and those will be put in an
22 appendix to a project excavation report that will be put
23 together by the engineer, which is Treadwell and Rollo.
24 It's kind of a cooperative effort. But Treadwell and
25 Rollo will be doing most of the interpretive writing,

Page 10

1 and we rely on the contractor for basic recordkeeping.

2 MR. BERMAN: The report is really Treadwell
3 and Rollo's. They're the people that will write the --

4 MR. FORD: They will have a representative on
5 site every day during the work. We're going to have
6 plenty of folks out there. We're going to have a
7 biological monitor there full time at the beginning of
8 the project. That's the condition of our Fish and
9 Wildlife Service approval. If we see anything that
10 looks even remotely interesting, we'll have
11 archaeologists out there. It's going to be a busy job
12 site.

13 MR. COOPER: By the time we have our next RAB
14 meeting in October, we should be poised to commence
15 actual excavation of those landfills. That's pretty
16 exciting for us and for everybody.

17 MR. BERMAN: One more question. I am trying
18 to understand the financial arrangements here. Does the
19 6 million that's going to be contracted money, there is
20 going to be in-house supervision and in-house
21 activity? Supposedly there are people involved in that
22 also, or is it just going to be the usual staff?

23 MR. COOPER: The usual staff. We have
24 Treadwell and Rollo as our contracted oversight
25 contractor to oversee the construction contractors, and

Page 11

1 George overseeing Treadwell and overall operations.

2 MR. FORD: It's the same people that will be
3 working right now, just running faster.

4 MR. BERMAN: That's why I was asking about
5 additional Trust staff involved.

6 MR. FORD: No. I don't know if this has been
7 discussed in other meetings, but the Trust personnel
8 hours are not chargeable against our deductible and our
9 self-insured retention with Zurich. I actually believe
10 that the Trust Environmental group has already peaked on
11 its size. Six months ago it reached its peak at 14 or
12 15 people. It's smaller now. It will either stay the
13 same or get smaller. It won't go back up. We're trying
14 to focus a lot of attention on keeping those
15 non-chargeable costs as low as we can. So it will just
16 be me and the people from Treadwell.

17 MR. O'HARA: George, why do we necessarily
18 need to have an archeologist? The history of those
19 sites doesn't go back that far, or none of the dumping
20 in there is of a nature that you would ordinarily
21 expect. You're not going below the original grade, are
22 you?

23 MR. FORD: No. We're just planning to dig
24 back down to the original ground surface. I guess what
25 I'm saying is the archeological or cultural resource

Page 12

1 interest covers a pretty long span.

2 This is an example. We pulled a hydraulic cylinder out
3 of Building 937 -- It was one of these car lifts -- so
4 that they could lift up a vehicle and get under it and
5 work on it. As we were going through that process, I
6 was told that the cultural resource preservation staff
7 are interested in stuff like that -- plumbing, sort of
8 gas-station type plumbing hardware -- up through the
9 Cold War era. So even in the '50s, it was something
10 that had been installed as late as the '50s was
11 potentially of interest. They don't make a blanket
12 statement that everything is precious and has to be
13 saved. But if there was a possibility that it was as
14 recent as the 50s, they want to come look at it and make
15 a judgment. So at a site like this, we definitely have
16 the possibility of things from the '40s and '50s.

17 It's my hope -- it's better for me if we find nothing
18 but dirt and rocks in there we can throw them in the
19 truck and send them off and get it done quickly. And if
20 we do find things that appear to have cultural value, we
21 can bring in the experts to look at it. And the good
22 news is the Trust and the Park Service have people like
23 that on staff who are local. They're here on the base,
24 and we can get them when we need them.

25 MR. BERMAN: The archeology cutoff begins

Page 13

1 (INAUDIBLE)
 2 MR. COOPER: So under other CERCLA -- actually
 3 the last RAB meeting I believe it was -- personnel gave
 4 an overview of our Landfill E Field Sampling Plan. We
 5 have now received comments on that Plan from the
 6 Regional Water Quality Control Board from Jim. We are
 7 trying to set up a meeting with the reviewer from DTSC,
 8 this guy in Sacramento, and Bob, bring him out to the
 9 site. And that meeting and review from DTSC is still to
 10 be scheduled.
 11 Plus, if we're going to be able to pull this off with
 12 winter approaching, at the latest, if we're going to be
 13 able to do this investigation this year, it needs to
 14 commence in October or November at the latest.
 15 Under the Public Health Service Hospital Project Review
 16 Work Plan, the first bullet is not accurate. DTSC and
 17 the Regional Board actually completed their review of
 18 our Initial Work Plan on that. You might want to change
 19 that. I'll given a complete overview of where that Work
 20 Plan is later on this evening.
 21 All right. The Feasibility Study. We are resurrecting
 22 this. Now that we have the cleanup levels, it looks
 23 like we've got good agreement with the regulatory
 24 agencies, especially DTSC, on the cleanup levels. We've
 25 gotten over the ARARs hump. We can get the Feasibility

Page 14

1 Study going again for the Main Installation. So Chris
 2 Nelson has contracted EKI to get that going and get it
 3 back up to date again. We plan to give it to Brian at
 4 the Park Service in December, and then we hope to be
 5 able to release it to the regulatory agencies by
 6 January. That's the Feasibility Study itself. What
 7 will be ahead of that will be the cleanup level
 8 document, which is just not a big deal anymore. The
 9 Feasibility Study is what's really important. So stay
 10 tuned on that.
 11 MR. BERMAN: What's the plan for Landfill E?
 12 Should that be a separate item?
 13 MR. COOPER: The Feasibility Study will have
 14 Landfill E in there. It will basically stop after the
 15 initial stream of alternatives for Landfill E. There
 16 will be a paragraph in there to say that there isn't
 17 sufficient data to complete the nine criteria analysis
 18 of alternatives to Landfill E, and that we're actually
 19 conducting the Field Sampling Plan (INAUDIBLE) because
 20 by then it would be probably completed. But we're
 21 waiting for the data to come in.
 22 So on Landfill E, the alternative analysis will not be
 23 included, and therefore there will be no recommended
 24 remedy for Landfill E in this draft or the Feasibility
 25 Study. So for Landfill E, after we finish this Field

Page 15

1 Sampling Plan and get the final data report from that
 2 Field Sampling Plan, only then when everybody gets a
 3 chance to take a look at that data -- and I'm sure we'll
 4 have a couple of meetings on that data -- only then
 5 would we finish the Feasibility Study for Landfill E.
 6 So let's take our time on Landfill E. I know that
 7 everybody is really interested in that one. So let's
 8 let the data come in and have everybody digest it.
 9 MR. BERMAN: Why are you including Landfill E
 10 in the FS?
 11 MR. COOPER: Just as a place holder for the
 12 most part; just to tell people that there's this site in
 13 the Main Installation Operable Unit that this
 14 Feasibility Study is covering. But it's just telling
 15 all reviewers that this one site -- we're not quite
 16 ready to select a remedy yet. It's just advisory, I
 17 guess.
 18 MR. BERMAN: It just seems a little strange.
 19 MR. COOPER: We could completely remove it,
 20 but then -- I don't know.
 21 MR. BERMAN: There are other sites here on the
 22 Presidio besides those that are in the FS anyway.
 23 MR. COOPER: Yeah, but not in the Main
 24 Installation Operable Unit. You know how the Army
 25 sliced up all the Operable Units --

Page 16

1 MR. BERMAN: That's sort of an arbitrary --
 2 MR. COOPER: This Feasibility Study is called
 3 the Main Installation Operable Unit Feasibility Study.
 4 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is the first step of the
 5 Feasibility Study screen technology, so all the landfill
 6 technologies could be done together. The technology
 7 won't change. So the follow-up document can supplement
 8 the FS, as opposed to having to do it all over again.
 9 (INAUDIBLE) And so there is some efficiency in putting
 10 what is out there and then adding to it as more
 11 information comes in. It could go either way.
 12 MR. COOPER: Okay. Next slide. Now our next
 13 RAP, as everybody knows, is going to be on Baker Beach
 14 Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6. Now that we've
 15 kind of cleared the deck on Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5,
 16 and the Contingency Site RAW -- which I'll explain in a
 17 second -- I'm able to refocus my attention on that
 18 particular RAP. And I want to get that one going again.
 19 So there was some loose ends concerning that RAP that I
 20 needed to fix before it was in good enough shape for the
 21 Trust and the Park Service to release to the regulatory
 22 agencies. We hope to get the next RAP over to Brian in
 23 October and then release the first draft of that
 24 particular RAP to the regulatory agencies by the end of
 25 November. So that one's going again. It was a resource

Page 17

1 crunch, and it got slowed down a little bit. All right.
 2 Now on the base-wide Contingency Site Removal Action
 3 Work Plan or RAW, we've been briefing you for the last
 4 several months about our progress on that. What
 5 happened is that -- I'll let Bob take it from here --
 6 DTSC has said that they could not accept a Presidio-wide
 7 document for this. At least for the time being, the
 8 document is not progressing.

9 MR. BOGGS: Just to provide a little
 10 information on that. It's actually not that DTSC
 11 decided a base-wide RAW couldn't be done. We have a
 12 unit that actually reviews documents for CEQA
 13 compliance. Their point is that it can't be done with
 14 an initial study and with a negative declaration. It's
 15 basically a negative declaration under CEQA that says
 16 "We're declaring there is going to be no negative
 17 environmental effects from this."
 18 Part of our group says you can't just declare this a
 19 negative dec for the Presidio. You have endangered
 20 species. You have historic artifacts. You have all
 21 these things. For some unknown site that you may have,
 22 you can't adequately address all the potential
 23 environmental concerns with this little initial study
 24 and negative dec. We said, "Therefore, per CEQA, this
 25 project qualifies for an EIR, a full-blown Environmental

Page 18

1 Impact Report." So that battle has gone on back and
 2 forth between our department quite a bit. Most people
 3 even on both sides agree that this Contingency RAW would
 4 be a good way of implementing small remedial actions if
 5 and when they are discovered. The Department likes the
 6 idea. But we have many individuals that don't think it
 7 can be done without a full-blown EIR.
 8 One of the other things we had looked at is under CEQA,
 9 there is a certain number of exemptions. There is a
 10 Class 30 Category Code exception, and there is a Section
 11 15525 through 15555 which specifies how we can determine
 12 NEPA and CEQA equivalency. The Legal Department has
 13 been looking back and forth with this and basically has
 14 come up with that the sites that qualify for No Further
 15 Action in the Presidio -- i.e. sites that have been
 16 cleaned up -- they clearly qualified for what's called
 17 the Class 30 Exemption. The Class 30 Exemption
 18 basically says if you're in the middle of a construction
 19 project and you have a site that's not on the
 20 (INAUDIBLE) list -- a state list of all the contaminated
 21 sites -- if you're not on this list, i.e. any site that
 22 we specify as No Further Action is taken off of this
 23 list, you can do this Class 30 Exemption. It basically
 24 allows for removals up to \$1 million, small removals.
 25 That's basically what this RAW was designed to do.

Page 19

1 So sites such as Letterman, where we're reviewing the
 2 Letterman Closure Report right now, that's going to be a
 3 No Further Action Site that will qualify for one of
 4 these up-to-\$1-million cleanups under a Class 30
 5 exception. Similarly, Crissy Field sites, EEA sites or
 6 sites where we've cleaned them up, they qualify for a
 7 Class 30 Exemption.

8 There is another path that is still being evaluated on
 9 how we can address future sites when these come up. I
 10 think that's still being worked on. But at this point,
 11 we're kind of at a stalemate for getting a base-wide RAW
 12 through without an EIR.

13 MR. BERMAN: (INAUDIBLE)

14 MR. BOGGS: I'm getting into a little detail
 15 here, but you're educated. Yes. It is very parallel.
 16 That's how in the future we plan to handle all these.
 17 When the Presidio has a project, such as excavating
 18 lights or something, through their (INAUDIBLE) process,
 19 they will probably have to modify it a little bit to
 20 meet the CEQA requirements as well. Right now, they
 21 don't have to because it's a federal project on federal
 22 land. They don't have to do CEQA. However, cleanups
 23 come under state purview and there's an argument that
 24 this would have to meet CEQA requirements. For any
 25 future project, they can have this Contingency RAW as a

Page 20

1 management plan if they encounter soil, as long as that
 2 gets the equivalent of our CEQA review. That's what
 3 this 15550 exemption is, is basically showing NEPA and
 4 CEQA equivalency. So by carrying it through their NEPA
 5 review process, it essentially is the equivalent of
 6 getting it carried through on the CEQA process. They
 7 can do that because for an individual project, as
 8 opposed to the whole Presidio, we can supposedly define
 9 all the environmental concerns in our initial study.
 10 Whereas presidio-wide, people don't think you can
 11 address all those potential concerns. So that's most
 12 likely the process that will be used in the future to
 13 address possible contamination in small areas.

14 MR. BERMAN: We'll need a full-blown EIR.

15 MR. FORD: No. We're trying to stay away from
 16 that.

17 MR. BERMAN: That could take years.

18 MR. COOPER: The Trust does not want to do an
 19 EIR for a base-wide document. As far as a base-wide,
 20 Presidio-wide RAW, Removal Action Work Plan, I don't see
 21 that being resurrected any time soon. I think what we
 22 are going to take a look at is project by project --

23 MR. BOGGS: That's essentially what will
 24 happen. The Letterman Project, we could go out there
 25 and say there's no endangered species out there and feel

Page 21

1 pretty confident about that. It's just basically
2 progressing on a project-by-project basis so that we
3 could have a handle on what all the potential
4 environmental impacts are.

5 MR. PONTON: Would there be any value in
6 limiting the RAW to the contingency sites that meet the
7 negative dec status -- ones that are in areas where you
8 plan development, where you're outside sensitive areas,
9 outside the areas that would trigger -- as it limits
10 size, can't it limit scope to CEQA areas that are neg
11 dec areas to begin with?

12 MR. BOGGS: The one problem is you limit it to
13 the non-ecological areas. Then you've got historical
14 impacts, artifacts. Like if we were digging right next
15 door. That is how we tried to do this Contingency RAW
16 is really by saying okay, it's only up to 2000 yards.
17 Really limiting what the potential impacts could be.
18 But we're running into a wall in trying to get that
19 pushed through. We tried even further limiting sites
20 that could qualify.

21 MR. PONTON: Isn't this whole property an
22 archeological site? And the Letterman Complex falls
23 within that boundary. It's not an ecological zone, but
24 it falls within an ecological site.

25 MR. BOGGS: Right. It's part of the EIS that

Page 22

1 was done for that. When they construct, they do have
2 archeology (INAUDIBLE) taken care of. And so on a
3 project-specific basis, they did account for that
4 potential.

5 MR. PONTON: We can't plug that into the RAW?

6 MR. BOGGS: We can, but I know that our group
7 in Sacramento has a lot of opposition. As soon as we
8 stack one more up on those, that's some limit there.
9 And they become very uncomfortable going from this blank
10 Letterman site, which they don't have a problem with,
11 to then saying well, as soon as we start (INAUDIBLE) it
12 a little bit, they have a lot of problems with it. And
13 then it starts the EIR.

14 MR. FORD: Letterman's a tough example because
15 it had an EIR, or an EIS done before.

16 MR. COOPER: Okay. In a nutshell, for me, I
17 think Bob and I both are disappointed the way this has
18 turned out. We were hoping to get this Decision
19 Document out. We have this official process that
20 everybody knows about, a proactive process.
21 But you know, in my perspective, it's not the end of the
22 world. I'm disappointed, but maybe next year sometime.
23 I just got two other RAPS I have to start focusing on.
24 Just worrying about this could be a huge resource drain
25 for us at the Trust right now. With our new lean and

Page 23

1 mean staffing structure, we don't have a lot of
2 resources to dive into this. We basically said, "All
3 right. We'll figure it out another way, or at least for
4 the time being. We might next year take a look at this
5 issue, whether an EIR is really necessary; maybe sit
6 down with DTSC and decide and really try to understand
7 where they're coming from." But at this point in time,
8 I got other RAPs to write right now and a Feasibility
9 Study to go with it. I can't be bogged down on one
10 document. So --

11 MR. KERN: It would be interesting to -- since
12 this particular document goes back -- it's one of the
13 first things the Trust started to work on when they took
14 over agency status. It would be interesting to look at
15 how much time, money, and effort has been spent on
16 developing this document.

17 MR. COOPER: A lot.

18 MR. KERN: What do you think it would be?

19 MR. COOPER: Million.

20 MR. FORD: No. It's not that high.

21 MR. COOPER: EKI costs alone I think are 150
22 to 200,000, and then there is everybody's time and
23 efforts, DTSC and Trust, labor and Brian's time. That's
24 300,000 at least. So it hurts.

25 MR. KERN: I know. I commented on it three

Page 24

1 times.

2 MR. COOPER: We got so close. That was the
3 killer.

4 MR. BOGGS: In six months or so -- it's
5 actually an interdepartmental issue for our department.
6 A lot of these bases go to development. How do we deal
7 with or address when developers go into these places to
8 be able to handle these things? It's starting an
9 internal battle, and I don't think it's going to get
10 resolved in our timeframe. It was my boss's boss that
11 really -- nine months ago when we were saying whether it
12 was going to be a site-specific Letterman thing or a
13 base-wide thing, my management said base-wide would be a
14 great way to handle it. Other departmental people
15 don't think so.

16 MR. KERN: Well, it would be nice if those
17 other folks knew the total effort that was put in here
18 to get that squared away, just so they didn't make that
19 sort of decision in a vacuum. Not that I think they
20 would. It's been a long effort. A long road.

21 MR. BERMAN: A public comment. It had the
22 features of a very responsible document, very
23 forward-looking and a willingness to take into account
24 all of the issues. I personally am disappointed to see
25 this happen, because it's actually one of the really

Page 25

1 good products that has been developed by the Trust.
 2 Looking at all of the Presidio -- for every RAP that you
 3 write, you've going to have to draw on this document
 4 anyway, in some sense, because you've got the
 5 undiscovered -- the possibilities of undiscovered and of
 6 possibly things that weren't taken into account in the
 7 RAP itself. I'm just sort of flabbergasted why you
 8 would need an EIR because the idea is that you can deal
 9 with a small problem. EIR is not for a small problem.
 10 It's Presidio-wide, but it's for a little piece of the
 11 action that might occur during a RAP procedure. To me,
 12 it looks, it smells of environmental Marxism.

13 MR. COOPER: I know that Bob personally did
 14 everything he could to push this through his agency. So
 15 it's not on the lack of effort on his part. I
 16 personally have some concerns. I am aware that CEQA
 17 people know where we're coming from. But I do want
 18 everyone to know that should we hit unknown
 19 contamination in the future, the Trust still plans on
 20 sending out notifications.
 21 For example, we've recently discovered those two tanks
 22 near Battery Chamberland. We've faxed out
 23 notifications. We're going to follow those procedures.
 24 When we fax out the notifications, we'll tell you the
 25 procedures that we're going to follow basically. That's

Page 26

1 how it's going to go until we get a document -- if we
 2 ever get a document. I will promise you when we find
 3 something, we'll fax out notifications. We'll tell you
 4 the procedures that we're going to follow at each of
 5 these contingency sites. But it's basically going to be
 6 done Ad-Hoc, site by site, as we find them. That's the
 7 down side. Enough said on that one.
 8 Mountain Lake. Another favorite subject of everybody's.
 9 One thing that we at the Trust have done and now I was
 10 just told today by Chris -- it's a promise we made a
 11 long time ago, so it's not going to be news to you -- we
 12 have procured our contractor to go ahead and start
 13 moving forward with a remedial design. We know what the
 14 remedy is going to be there. The hard part is not going
 15 to be necessarily writing the RAP for Mountain Lake. We
 16 really know what the Feasibility Study and what the RAPs
 17 are going to look like. The tricky part is working out
 18 the details of implementing that remedy. So we've
 19 contracted with DRS to start thinking through the
 20 preliminary remedial design, and all the data gaps, and
 21 all the action items that we need to go through to
 22 basically conduct a protective remedy in Mountain Lake,
 23 to dredge out the contaminated sediment.
 24 That is going to take some time. So don't think that
 25 we're going to be turning out some preliminary design

Page 27

1 anytime soon. That's why I decided to -- let's start
 2 working on this now. Just wanted to tell you that. In
 3 six or nine months from now, we'll do a presentation on
 4 how the implementation aspects are looking. So looking
 5 on the Caltrans side, I think Bob can speak now for an
 6 agency update.

7 MR. BOGGS: I called Isabela today just
 8 specifically for that. She recently had conversations
 9 with JoAnna, the Trust attorney. The Trust attorney
 10 helped my case in prompting her along. We have started
 11 discussions with Caltrans. I had a second call with
 12 them, and they're going to continue to have some
 13 discussions, but DTSC is backing off sending the next
 14 nasty letter for a while. They're going to try to have
 15 some discussions for a while.

16 MR. BERMAN: What are they discussing?

17 MR. BOGGS: I think they're discussing why we
 18 think that they are potentially liable for some of the
 19 cleanup of Mountain Lake, and they are saying they
 20 aren't responsible even for one drop of it, and go take
 21 a hike. And then there is a couple of associated issues
 22 regarding existing storm drains etc., etc., to be
 23 diverted.

24 MR. BERMAN: So they're talking, but they're
 25 not moving.

Page 28

1 MR. BOGGS: It's attorneys posturing at this
 2 point.

3 MR. BERMAN: At some point, do you think a
 4 political group might need to be explored on that?

5 MR. BOGGS: Yeah. I think political
 6 motivations are why letters aren't going to be written
 7 between -- nasty letters between two state agencies at
 8 this point in time.

9 MR. BERMAN: It seems to me that that might be
 10 the ultimate way to get it resolved. At some level.

11 MR. BOGGS: Yes. I think we could get there,
 12 but the feedback on the latest phone call, I don't think
 13 we'll get there too quick.

14 MR. HULTGREN: What's the final remedy if the
 15 two agencies can't agree?

16 MR. BOGGS: That's a good question. I don't
 17 know that for sure. I was mentioning several
 18 possibilities of directions that this could go -- i.e.,
 19 at some point there was talk that DTSC would step out of
 20 it and let the Trust and Caltrans fight it out.
 21 Presumably the Trust could sue Caltrans for part of the
 22 cleanup. We would, of course, end up weighing in most
 23 likely after that point.

24 MR. HULTGREN: If that happens, could the
 25 Trust file suit against Caltrans, since they're

1 different entities, different governmental -- one's
2 federal and one's state?

3 MR. BOGGS: I don't know the legal ins and
4 outs of how that works. I imagine there is some kind of
5 administrative procedures that have to be gone through
6 before a suit is filed. That is definitely the case
7 between us and Caltrans. It goes up the chain to the
8 governor's office.

9 MR. HULTGREN: You really can't sue Caltrans,
10 isn't that correct? Since you've both part of the State
11 of California?

12 MR. BOGGS: Right.

13 MR. O'HARA: Is there some point a mediation
14 process between the two state agencies where they
15 seemingly can't resolve an issue? You submit it to
16 arbitration and mediation?

17 MR. BOGGS: I can find out the details of the
18 steps. I know there are several steps involved. I know
19 pretty much the next major step that we go to is the
20 governor's office. We get what's called a GAR,
21 Governor's Action Request, where the governor actually
22 signs a letter asking Caltrans to do something or take
23 some action.

24 MR. BERMAN: Once the governor writes that,
25 that's the end of it, isn't it?

1 MR. BOGGS: I would hope so.

2 MR. FORD: This is Caltrans we're talking
3 about.

4 MR. BOGGS: Right. That's what I was saying.
5 Politically, from the feedback I got, it's probably not
6 going to happen until the end of November.

7 MR. BERMAN: Is it possible to envision a
8 scenario where the Trust says, "Okay. We'll pay for
9 it." And now we're going to ask Caltrans to divert the
10 stormdrains so this doesn't recur? Could Caltrans at
11 that point say, dig in their heels again and simply
12 say -- the Trust goes to them and says, "We're paying
13 for this. We cleaned it all up. We don't want it to
14 recur," and Caltrans would say, "Too bad. It's going to
15 recur anyway, because we're not going to do anything.
16 You have to do it."

17 MR. BOGGS: Well, they may say there's no
18 longer leaded fuel in cars. It won't happen anyways.
19 That was the real culprit, all those citizens driving
20 those cars. It's my understanding they have the
21 statewide permit for such discharges. Then it starts
22 becoming a question of sensitive species habitat and
23 other mitigating factors that may require special
24 discharge. So there is a good chance they would dig in
25 their heels saying there's no basis for having to remove

1 those storm drains at this point in time.

2 MR. BERMAN: In your concept of the cleanup
3 and the eventual disposition that followed, do you have
4 in mind an alteration of the existing storm drain
5 system?

6 MR. COOPER: You mean this preliminary
7 remedial design? This is an issue we want to take a
8 look at, because we don't want this issue to return.
9 And so it's one of the things that we're looking at as
10 to whether the remedy is going to be just a
11 sediment-dredging remedy or is it going to be
12 sediment-dredging with a rerouting of the storm drains?
13 And get that as part of the remedy too. So we need to
14 do some thinking and talk to Bob and see whether that is
15 likely to be. Because the remedial design has to match
16 what the RAP is going to say. We know the RAP is going
17 to say dredge the sediment. I don't know for sure
18 whether the RAP is going to say reroute the storm
19 drains. So before I have (INAUDIBLE) work on that, I
20 need some confidence that the RAP is going to say that.

21 MR. SUTTER: With diesel fuel now being
22 determined to be toxic, would that affect the future of
23 the drains and (INAUDIBLE) not be a remedy?

24 MR. BOGGS: Well, we did find TPH in the
25 sediment. And so the argument can be made regarding the

1 toxicity -- whether it's gasoline or diesel. I think

2 that information supports that argument that the drains
3 should be rerouted. Whether it solidifies that argument
4 and tells Caltrans to do it or not, that might be a
5 different story.

6 MR. BERMAN: In their statewide permit report
7 allowing them to do certain kind of drainage, are there
8 exceptions? Caltrans is going to try to obviously stick
9 to the rules as much as possible. So the question is --
10 it's written by lawyers. There is always exceptions.

11 MR. BOGGS: I'm not sure where those
12 exceptions are in their permit and how they're written
13 or constructed. I really don't know that. I think any
14 action we would take at Mountain Lake would happen
15 outside of their statewide permit. We're going to have
16 to show some special considerations here on why this
17 discharge is a particular concern versus every roadway
18 throughout the state.

19 MR. KERN: I think it might be good for us to
20 think what the RAB might do as a group at our next or
21 one of the upcoming committee meetings as an agenda
22 topic on Mountain Lake. Because we've certainly been
23 hearing this for months and years, so we haven't really
24 done anything in a while, from our view. So maybe it's
25 time for a little activism. We can join up with Friends

Page 33

1 of Mountain Lake and do some brainstorming.
 2 MR. COOPER: All right. Lead-based Paint in
 3 Soils Program keeping chugging along slowly. One
 4 important point on the last bullet is we want to get the
 5 regulators to okay that the procedures that we are using
 6 are acceptable to them as far as our cleanup process.
 7 So that plan will be issued to both DTSC and the
 8 Regional Board hopefully by October. It might slip a
 9 little bit into November. We have a draft that Brian
 10 and I have both looked at. We're going to sit down with
 11 our contractors next week Monday. So stay tuned for
 12 that particular document.

13 MR. O'HARA: Looking out a little bit further
 14 with respect to lead-based paint in soils, assuming that
 15 there is some sort of rehabilitation or rerouting or
 16 reconstruction of Doyle Drive, if we start dealing with
 17 the soils there, it is my understanding that Caltran's
 18 contribution to the lead-based paint that's in the soil
 19 is outside the scope of (INAUDIBLE) here. But somebody
 20 is going to have to pop for cleaning that lead soil up
 21 if there is a rerouting of the highway. Who would that
 22 be?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: That work has been already
 24 done. Caltrans did a cleanup (INAUDIBLE) probably about
 25 '96 or '97.

Page 34

1 MR. O'HARA: Did they completely clean it up?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: They had an agreement with
 3 DTSC for a certain cleanup level and met that level. I
 4 don't recall what that level was.

5 MR. KERN: I think it was 300.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: That seems reasonable from my
 7 recollection.

8 MR. O'HARA: Wasn't that an accommodation so
 9 that they could get the --

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was with the Bridge
 11 District. The two happened about the same time
 12 coincidentally, I believe. But the Bridge District
 13 looked at the lead under the bridge in areas that were
 14 necessary to accommodate the seismic retrofit, and the
 15 Bridge District did that first phase of the cleanup and
 16 is now in the process of studying and doing the risk
 17 assessment work for the (INAUDIBLE) on that. It would
 18 be a multiyear study. But Caltrans, separate from the
 19 Bridge District, did a cleanup of the lead that resulted
 20 from the sandblasting operations on the metal viaduct
 21 bridge on Doyle Drive. My recollection was that they
 22 were under agreement with the state. They met the state
 23 requirements and that they were done.

24 MR. BOGGS: That's what they call a CCA, a
 25 Voluntary Cleanup Agreement, and if such a thing

Page 35

1 happened again, with paint chips flying everywhere,
 2 Caltrans would go dig it up. That one's pretty much cut
 3 and dry.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's not related to an
 5 exhaust problem (INAUDIBLE), but is due to their
 6 maintenance operation of sandblasting at the
 7 construction.

8 MR. O'HARA: No, no. I recognize the complete
 9 difference of issues here. It was simply we had jumped
 10 from Mountain Lake to the lead-based paint. I know that
 11 there was -- what at the time they were describing as
 12 sort of a wink-wink situation where part of the lead was
 13 cleaned up, so that the State would send in workers to
 14 do the seismic retrofit. But my sense was that it was
 15 not a place where you would want your children playing.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: My recollection of the first
 17 phase is that they were reasonable. I don't recall
 18 exactly what they were. They were not exorbitant. They
 19 are including that in their ecological work for their
 20 Phase Two investigation which they -- this Spring did
 21 the sampling to begin their ecological studies under the
 22 bridge approach.

23 MR. O'HARA: What is the relationship between
 24 those agencies in the Trust and DTSC? Who's the lead
 25 agency here? Who makes the final determination?

Page 36

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: It would be different
 2 (INAUDIBLE) But the Bridge District is working with
 3 DTSC, and the Park Service is participating in many of
 4 those discussions. I'm not aware of any discussion of
 5 Caltrans on Doyle Drive that lead cleanup is associated
 6 with. DTSC would be the lead agency. There are of
 7 course discussions on the redesign of Doyle Drive, but
 8 that's separate from the (INAUDIBLE).

9 MR. O'HARA: That I would recognize. But
 10 somebody is going to have to pay a price sooner or
 11 later.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: DTSC is taking an active role
 13 with the Bridge District in dealing with the lead
 14 cleanup, and the Park Service has been participating
 15 because the Park Service has lands where the bulk of
 16 contamination is.

17 MR. O'HARA: Thank you.

18 MR. FORD: Okay. I'll try to go through my
 19 slides reasonably quickly. Craig still has the Landfill
 20 8 and 10 Work Plan overview to go after I finish.
 21 For LAIR, we sent a Draft Closure Report in. We revised
 22 it once because we found some problems with the first
 23 version we sent in. The second version is with Bob and
 24 Jim. When we get their comments, we will turn it around
 25 quickly because we're getting pressure from the Lucas

Page 37

1 end. We'd like to close the site out for our own
2 reasons, but they're of course anxious to have an
3 agency-approved report that says, "Gee, your site looks
4 pretty good, and it would be okay to build on." We're
5 anxious to get that finished.

6 MR. BERMAN: Are there any issues involved
7 here, or just process?

8 MR. FORD: No. We think it's pretty much
9 done. As the buildings were being demolished, we did
10 some sampling to look for residues (INAUDIBLE) and
11 didn't find anything there. What we did find was I
12 think four different petroleum occurrences that appear
13 to be mostly in backfill soil placed against the
14 building after it was constructed.
15 Then we also found some pesticides. We had some hits of
16 Chlordane below the floor slabs at LAIR that exceeded
17 the current cleanup levels. We dug that up and got rid
18 of it. We think we're done. We hope that everybody
19 else eventually agrees. We're going through that
20 process right now.
21 I wanted to go through some of the petroleum stuff.
22 This is partly driven out of guilt. I think Sam asked
23 for a petroleum overview about a year ago. And I said,
24 "We'll get it to you shortly." It's almost ready. We
25 haven't been able to get our text and table together to

Page 38

1 hand it out. We hope to have it on the street before
2 the next RAB meeting.
3 Anyhow, once you get the Plan and the table, here's the
4 thing it's going to say. As far as the small part of
5 the Petroleum Program, which is the tanks and the Mini
6 Caps, kind of the smaller occurrences, right now our
7 records show that we have only 12 tanks in the ground
8 remaining in the whole Presidio. Six of those happen
9 to be under the basement floors of residential units
10 that are currently occupied. We can't really take those
11 out until the units turn over and the tenants move out.
12 People don't like it very much when we have to dig out
13 their basement floors.
14 So anyhow, it turns out there are not very many tanks
15 left in the ground here at the Presidio, which I think
16 is good news. We have roughly 30 Mini Cap sites. A
17 Mini Cap site is a place where a tank -- in most cases
18 they were sites where a tank has been removed and the
19 tank leaked. And when the Army was pulling tanks, they
20 budgeted a certain amount of money per tank, \$15 or
21 \$20,000.
22 They would remove the tank and remove contaminated soil,
23 counting the dollars as they went. As soon as the
24 budget was spent, they stopped, backfilled the hole and
25 went away. We had quite a few sites where the Army has

Page 39

1 done a partial cleanup, and we have to finish them off.
2 Out of those Mini Caps, we think there are roughly 30 of
3 them where we physically have to do some more work at
4 the site. We either have to do some more digging, or in
5 some cases, it may be sufficient to do some soil
6 groundwater sampling to demonstrate that it was a minor
7 leak and it had no effect on groundwater.
8 Out of those 30, we have ten of them grouped together.
9 10 of the sites we're starting later this month. They
10 include the Mini Cap Sites that are in the big barracks,
11 Buildings 100 through 104, along the Main Parade ground.
12 We hope to knock 10 of those 30 out in fairly short
13 order.
14 Then the other thing is we have four Corrective Action
15 Projects. Those are all underway right now. They're in
16 various stages of investigation. We're moving on all of
17 them. The Corrective Action Projects are areas where
18 you see they had multiple petroleum spills, or a single
19 big spill. But in each case, there are areas where we
20 think groundwater has been affected by a petroleum
21 spill. So where groundwater has been affected, it isn't
22 a simple small cleanup anymore. We have to take a look
23 at what groundwater has been affected and do a more
24 extensive investigation and some more extensive remedial
25 planning. But our Cap areas are the Commissary PX,

Page 40

1 which we're actually doing soil and groundwater
2 sampling. It is occurring in two phases. It started
3 about a month ago and will continue for another month or
4 two.
5 We're just about at the same status on the Building 1065
6 Corrective Action Area. Soil and groundwater sampling
7 is underway out there right now. The Building 1349
8 Corrective Action Site, we're moving quickly on that.
9 The first phase of work there needs to be coordinated
10 with the Fill Site 5 removal because Building 1349 is
11 actually a big oil storage tank that is right across the
12 street from Fill Site 5.
13 Probably the most complex one we have is the Building
14 207/231 Corrective Action site. They're multiple spills
15 there. They extend down under Doyle Drive. Technically
16 it's not that complicated, but politically it's a very
17 difficult site because it's right in the mouth of
18 Tennessee Hollow. It extends under Doyle Drive. We're
19 going to have to figure out how to dovetail the
20 Petroleum Cleanup work with the work on Doyle Drive and
21 also the restoration of Tennessee Hollow. We think that
22 one will probably take a little longer to work out all
23 the details.
24 MR. SUTTER: I'm just curious. On the 30
25 Mini-Cap sites where the Army maybe didn't complete the

Page 41

1 cleanup, could you go back at them for additional money,
2 or is it covered by the hundred million?

3 MR. FORD: It's covered by the hundred
4 million. The Mini Cap sites are all considered to be
5 known sites with respect to our dealing with the Army.

6 MR. SUTTER: Probably not that much money
7 involved.

8 MR. FORD: The individual ones tend to be
9 small. Where you have a large number of them, it adds
10 up. I feel pretty confident about -- I mean, we're
11 funded for this work. I'm pretty confident that we can
12 do what needs to be done without busting the budget.

13 MS. CHEEVER: I have two short questions. One
14 is Building 1349. There was quite a bit of hoopla when
15 the Army took it out. Are you saying it wasn't
16 completed?

17 MR. FORD: The Army did a good job. Brian,
18 you need to jump in here because this is not my personal
19 history. I think the Army did a fairly complete job
20 within the footprint of the former tank and immediately
21 adjacent to it. But the contamination did spread out
22 into Washington Boulevard, and there is some possibility
23 that it also ran down some utility trenches along
24 Washington Boulevard.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: The biggest problem there was

Page 42

1 the groundwater impact. It was a bigger job than they
2 had budgeted for. They did talk about doing the tank
3 removal (INAUDIBLE) If you recall, it went all the way
4 across Washington Boulevard as it was. They had even
5 planned to come back eventually.

6 MS. CHEEVER: My second question is for the 30
7 Mini-Cap sites. In recent years, we haven't heard much
8 about the Petroleum Program. How do you know that
9 these backfilled areas weren't completely cleaned up?

10 MR. FORD: The Army put together a Mini-Cap
11 report, which is essentially -- most of them are kind of
12 a form report. But they have analytical data in there
13 that shows -- for instance, they'll take a sidewall soil
14 sample or bottom soil sample of the material that
15 they're leaving in the hole. If that exceeds the
16 cleanup level -- and they're quite a few cases where
17 that occurs --

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Army had -- I think it
19 was on the order of 300 tanks -- where the scope of work
20 was to go in, remove the tank, take five feet, take a
21 sample and fill the hole back in. If it was dirty, they
22 still filled the hole back in. If it was clean, they
23 were done. But there was no opportunity to say, "If we
24 dig another two feet, we'll be done." This was not in
25 the scope. That didn't happen, and that is why we have

Page 43

1 about 30 of these to go back at.

2 MS. CHEEVER: But they had to test it. Did
3 the Trust know that when the hundred million dollars --

4 MR. FORD: Yeah. In the cost estimates that
5 were used to negotiate the settlement from the Army, the
6 EKI went through and tried to make reasonable
7 assumptions about which fraction of the Mini Caps would
8 require more digging, which would just require some
9 additional soil sampling, and which would not really
10 require anything other than a more sophisticated
11 analysis of the existing data. They tried to factor all
12 of that into the original cost estimate.

13 MS. CHEEVER: And did the same apply to
14 Building 1349? When the Army (INAUDIBLE) what they were
15 planning to do, they also had to test. That was
16 included in the report. That's been known for a long
17 time?

18 MR. FORD: Yes, right. We think that the Army
19 did roughly 9/10ths of what needed to be done in
20 Building 1349. What's left for us to do is about the
21 last 10 percent or so. It does involve soil sampling
22 and that sort of thing. You can always get surprised
23 when you start digging holes. We do think that the 1349
24 Cleanup is kind of -- it's in the nature of rounding up
25 the loose ends. The heavy work has already been done.

Page 44

1 MR. PONTON: I'd like to just add about the
2 Mini-Cap sites. I recently reviewed -- the idea here is
3 the strategy as a group, these sites have common
4 features, commonality together, so we can investigate
5 those groups and close them as groups. Recently there
6 was a grouping of the tanks associated with the building
7 on the Parade Ground, the former barracks. Just to be
8 fair to the Army, there are places where they left
9 contamination in place. But also these were places
10 where the building foundations and building features
11 precluded further digging because stability issues and
12 other issues that would have to be required. In the
13 Plan that was presented to us by the Trust, the
14 Corrective Action there was the same as what the Army
15 had done, and that was not do any further
16 characterization. I'd like to see -- network with
17 Jennifer on this and George -- groundwork
18 characterization to insure that there's not a
19 groundwater impact, and maybe a delineation of how big
20 those hot spots -- or those spots that exceed the
21 cleanup levels -- are, to better constrain them; but to
22 go back in beneath buildings, under footings, under
23 foundations and shore them for a limited gain is not
24 what I think anyone has in mind.

25 Just to be fair to the Army, there are places where they

Page 45

1 did the best they could, and there are places where they
2 could have done better.

3 MS. TRIGIANI: What percentage of the 30
4 Mini-Cap sites are under residential housing? And are
5 all 12 of those tanks under where people are living
6 right now?

7 MR. FORD: No. Six of them are. The other
8 six are in a variety of other buildings. I don't know
9 what fraction of -- Actually, I don't think there are
10 any Mini-Caps that are beneath basement floors in
11 residential units. There may be some that are out in
12 the yards, in residential areas. But I believe all the
13 ones that, where there is a small tank under the
14 basement floor, those were cleaned up.

15 MS. TRIGIANI: These don't pose any sort of
16 immediate danger?

17 MR. FORD: No.

18 MS. TRIGIANI: Either the Mini-Caps or the
19 existing tanks.

20 MR. FORD: No. They're deeply buried and
21 sealed off. In the cases where the tanks exist beneath
22 the floors, these are former heating oil tanks. They're
23 capped, and the feed pipes for them have been cut and
24 have threaded caps put on them. In most cases, they've
25 been painted over. They are really quite well sealed

Page 46

1 off. In some cases, in some of the units, they've
2 actually put wood floors over areas where the tanks are.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: So if there was a tank, it
4 was for heating the units? It wasn't some sort of
5 hiding place?

6 MR. FORD: Yes. In fact, all these tanks that
7 are in residential units, are basically little heating
8 oil -- they tend to be 300 to 400 gallons. They store
9 heating oil that used to be fed into the oil-fired
10 furnace. I think all the heating we have on the
11 Presidio now, all the furnaces are natural gas.
12 In cases like that, we've found that it's too disruptive
13 to try to remove it while the tenants are there. To go
14 into one of those units now, you'd never know that the
15 tanks was there. When we go in to remove it, sometimes
16 you do have odors. It's dusty and messy. We've just
17 concluded that it's better to do the removals when the
18 units become vacant because then we can get in and get
19 out. We can make a mess and get in and out in a couple
20 of days.

21 MS. TRIGIANI: Thank you.

22 MR. KERN: As a point of clarification. The
23 Cap means Corrective Action Plan. It's not an actual
24 capping. That's a document. And the Mini-Cap is a
25 small version --

Page 47

1 MR. FORD: Mini Corrective Action Plan.

2 MR. COOPER: I'd like to add one
3 clarification. I know people were asking about whether
4 it was within the 100 million or outside the 100
5 million. Anytime that the Trust encounters unknown
6 contamination that we feel is clearly outside the 100
7 million and outside the jurisdiction of the Army, we are
8 writing them letters requesting reimbursement for our
9 cleanup of that work. I think we did it a couple of
10 years ago in one case. Now we're kind of expanding
11 that. These tanks over on Battery Chamberlain Road.
12 We're written a letter to the Army on that. So we're
13 kind of putting them on notice, the whole unknown
14 contamination thing. I'm concerned that we're going to
15 get more and more, and it's whittling away at our 100
16 million.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Have you gotten any response to
18 any of the letters?

19 MR. COOPER: Not yet. Well, the first one we
20 did at the War Memorial, it was a positive response, and
21 they paid for it. But it was pretty small-scale. Each
22 one is pretty small scale. So we'll see. I've already
23 written one that just went out today. I'll be writing
24 another one. I'll have a final next week for some
25 unknown contamination that we actually cleaned up late

Page 48

1 last year. I'm now realizing with my new job and
2 whatever, we should have written a letter last year
3 about that, in my opinion. We'll see if we get
4 reimbursement on that too. I'm copying Mark on all
5 those letters, so Mark can at least track how that goes.
6 I don't know if the Army will copy Mark on their
7 responses back.

8 MR. SUTTER: You're nickel and diming them as
9 you go. You're not saving up the whole (INAUDIBLE).

10 MR. COOPER: The MOA says I need to notify if
11 there's a (INAUDIBLE). There is timeframe where I need
12 to notify them when the Trust finds this unknown
13 contamination. It's going to be one at a time. The
14 threshold is very difficult to meet the qualifications
15 of unknown contamination. We'll see how we fare.

16 MR. BERMAN: If it's a completely-sealed tank,
17 and there is no leakage, is it still a contaminant?

18 MR. COOPER: Unknown contamination? With
19 respect to the Trust requesting reimbursement?

20 MR. BERMAN: Yes. Even though it's completely
21 sealed.

22 MR. COOPER: If we think it's an Army tank,
23 yes. Because we still incur --

24 MR. FORD: The MOU contains within it a
25 presumption that tanks need to come out or they need to

Page 49

1 be emptied or dealt with. They can't just rest.

2 MR. BOGGS: In 1998, there was a law that
3 called for single wall underground tanks would have to
4 be replaced or taken out of service. It actually is a
5 requirement that they deal with.

6 MR. BERMAN: I know the Food and Drug and the
7 City of San Francisco, there are many old underground
8 heating oil tanks. There's a firm that goes around
9 carefully looking at every house that's 75 years old
10 looking for the air release somewhere, so that they
11 could get after the property owners for removing those.

12 MS. YAROS: You have to remove it when you
13 sell your house. You can't sell it unless you have it
14 taken out.

15 MR. FORD: I know San Francisco for quite a
16 while was permitting slurry filling in its place. They
17 pump out the oil and fill it out with weed concrete. I
18 think in the last several years they have gotten away
19 from that. They only permit it in extraordinary cases,
20 where it would be tremendously difficult to remove the
21 tank. Ten years ago, that's what everybody was doing.
22 It was a lot easier to fill it up with concrete than to
23 dig it out.

24 MR. BERMAN: Now they have to dig it out with
25 the concrete in it.

Page 51

1 break.

2 MR. FORD: Sure. We can either stop right
3 here, or I can -- I've got quite a few slides.

4 MR. KERN: Something like ten minutes.
5 (Break in proceedings.)

6 MR. FORD: Okay. We've identified roughly 130
7 sites that we think are eligible. We call them No
8 Further Action. The actual thing that is issued by the
9 City of San Francisco is a Construction Completion
10 Certification where they essentially are saying you've
11 done everything that needs to be done, or we won't
12 require you to do anything more based on the evidence we
13 have right now.

14 Out of these sites, I think roughly half of them have
15 already been submitted to the City of San Francisco, and
16 the other half -- this fraction is not exact -- the
17 other half, the Trust still has some work. We actually
18 have to prepare the report and submit it to the City.
19 So we have been working on that and getting those
20 reports ready and will continue to do that.

21 Roughly 40 sites have been closed out, meaning that the
22 tank's out, the cleanups done. We met all of the
23 cleanup standards, and we actually have a letter from
24 the City of San Francisco saying, "Your construction is
25 complete." The Army closed out several hundred sites on

Page 50

1 MR. FORD: It doesn't make it any easier.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: George, there is nothing else
3 buried under there?

4 MR. FORD: Not that we know of --

5 MS. TRIGIANI: There was a joke that there
6 might be an old bomb or something. When I heard you say
7 it was under residences, I was like, "Oh, no. That joke
8 is coming true."

9 MR. FORD: No. The heating oil tanks, it's
10 kind of expected that you'd find those either in or near
11 residential units because they held the heating oil that
12 was used to heat the building. But things like
13 explosives, the Army did have some unusual disposal
14 habits, but they don't put ordinance in residential
15 neighborhoods. It tended to go into things like
16 landfills.
17 Generally speaking around here, the most we ever find
18 are grenades and decorative cannonballs. Believe me, I
19 think you can go home and sleep at night. You don't
20 have to worry about Love Canal Park 2 under your house.
21 Generally I think our residential neighborhoods are
22 pretty clean.

23 MS. TRIGIANI: Great. Thanks.

24 MR. KERN: George, we might be headed towards
25 a break. So whenever you have a good moment for a

Page 52

1 their own, but this is since the Army left.

2 The thing that I have a problem about with the Petroleum
3 Program with the Army recordkeeping, and just kind of
4 the way things are in the Army, everybody rotated
5 through the base in three or four years. There wasn't a
6 lot of long-term recordkeeping. It's very hard to say
7 precisely what the number of tanks or Mini-Caps or
8 anything is. So these numbers are approximate. We
9 don't expect them to change a lot. It might turn out
10 that we have 13 or 14 tanks in ground instead of 12.
11 But I think these numbers are generally pretty accurate.
12 With what remains to be done, it looks like we can get
13 all the tanks out of the ground, do all the Mini-caps
14 that require some field work within roughly the next 12
15 to 18 months, do all the work and report on it. I am
16 optimistic that within about 18 months we can really be
17 finished with that part of the Petroleum Program. I
18 will be happy to get the little stuff off the table and
19 get it done.

20 Historically, since I've been here for three years, we
21 find somewhere between three and six unknown tanks each
22 year. I would guess that that will continue for the
23 foreseeable future. Usually these things get discovered
24 because somebody comes across them in a construction or
25 remodeling project. So when we find them, we take them

Page 53

1 out right away. That's what we've done in the past, and
 2 I think we'll continue doing that.
 3 I mentioned this stuff before, but the four Corrective
 4 Action sites are all moving along. 1065 and the
 5 Commissary are about neck and neck. They're out in
 6 front. We've made the most progress on those.
 7 Buildings 207, 231 Investigation is probably about six
 8 months behind 1065 and the PX. And Building 1349 is
 9 kind of a special case because we're trying to get that
 10 done roughly at the same time as the Fill Site 5
 11 removal, which is starting next month.

12 On the closure of Crissy Field, the Skeet Range
 13 Cleanup. We got a first draft report from Treadwell.
 14 The Trust and the Park Service provided comments. There
 15 were lots of comments. And so they took it back and
 16 they're working on a second draft. For the Fill Site 7
 17 and 900s area closure, we had a meeting on this topic
 18 with Treadwell last week. We gave them our comments on
 19 their first draft report. There is a typo in there.

20 We also concluded last week that it would be most
 21 efficient to split this -- this was a combined report
 22 that was dealing with Fill Site 7 and the 900 area.

23 We're really asking for different things in each
 24 area. Fill Site 7 is closed. It's done. There aren't
 25 follow-on monitoring requirements. So we think it makes

Page 54

1 sense to just split that off and make its own very brief
 2 concise report and then submit that to the agencies.
 3 And they can review that on its own merit.

4 The Building 900s report is a little more
 5 complicated, and so we think it would be better --
 6 basically we don't have Fill Site 7, which is
 7 straightforward and simple (INAUDIBLE). The Building
 8 900 is kind of complicated. So we're going to split
 9 them up and do a report for each one. Treadwell is
 10 working on both of those right now, and we hope to have
 11 revised reports basically available for external agency
 12 review in early to mid-October.

13 We're trying to get the Crissy Field buttoned up and
 14 closed out. The DEH report, Site Certification Report
 15 and Request for Site Certification was sent into the
 16 agencies just a little while ago. So we're hoping that
 17 they will digest that and smile favorably on a request
 18 for site certification.

19 Okay. And for the Groundwater Monitoring Program,
 20 the Annual Summary Report for last year has been
 21 submitted to the agencies, and they're looking at that.
 22 The Quarter 1, 2002 Internal Draft actually was
 23 delivered to the Trust today. I was supposed to bring
 24 Brian's copy here, and I forgot. So that's going
 25 through internal review, and presumably an external

Page 55

1 review copy will come out probably in October. And the
 2 Third Quarter 2002 Sampling finished last Friday. The
 3 groundwater monitoring I think is at long last becoming
 4 routine, and it took a long time for it to become
 5 routine for the Trust, but I think we're actually
 6 finally getting it.

7 I think that's all I have to say.

8 MR. BERMAN: It seems to me that if you look
 9 ahead probably in two, two and a half years, the Fill-in
 10 Program will be completed.

11 MR. COOPER: With the exception of those
 12 large-scale corrective action projects.

13 MR. FORD: I would say within two years we
 14 would have three out of four.

15 MR. BERMAN: I was making a guess that
 16 somewhere around then, you'd really be finished with all
 17 of the building sites, including the major cap. This
 18 would be kind of a very interesting time to make a
 19 little public statement about it and take some kudos for
 20 completing that action. I know it's a couple of years
 21 ahead, but it's reasonably well on its way. It's
 22 well-designed and it looks like the end is in sight. It
 23 looks to me like this will be the first Presidio-cleanup
 24 to be completed.

25 MR. FORD: I think it will be. I'm hoping

Page 56

1 that a couple of years down the road, we're going to
 2 have a lot of other things that we can thump our chests
 3 about, landfills that we've removed and stuff like that.
 4 But you're right. It probably is worth commemorating
 5 somehow.

6 I'll go a step farther. I'll bring the champagne to the
 7 meeting. I wheeze out of some things, but when I say
 8 I'm going to buy the drinks that I definitely do. But
 9 yes, it probably would be the first program that the
 10 Trust has brought to completion. We should do
 11 something. Fortunately, we've got a couple of years to
 12 plan it.

13 MR. BERMAN: The thing is, if you look at all
 14 the activities that has been going on for many years
 15 beyond that, that's sort of nice that you can actually
 16 see the end of the line on that.

17 MR. FORD: It does make sense to do something
 18 to commemorate it, just because it is nice to take note
 19 of when things get finished. If you don't pay any
 20 attention to that, it's an endless process where you're
 21 just pushing and pushing to do the next thing. You can
 22 count on me to bring it up when it gets close to the end
 23 of the Petroleum Program. If you don't mention it, I
 24 will. But I think it's a good idea.

25 MR. O'HARA: Can we characterize it, George,

Page 57

1 as on time and under budget?

2 MR. FORD: All of my projects are on time and
3 under budget, although in honesty I'd have to say that
4 frequently the schedule and the budget are revised as we
5 go along. They have to be. But I hope so. Our goal
6 here is to get change back from our hundred million, so
7 the money can be spent on some other things. We hope we
8 can do it.

9 MR. KERN: We're ready to move to the next
10 item.

11 MR. COOPER: I know it's late. I can do this
12 presentation. I'm ready to do this presentation. Mark
13 asked me to do it. I want to make sure that everybody
14 wants me to do it tonight. We can do it next month and
15 move it up to the first Trust presentation for next
16 month, or I'll plunge through tonight regarding Landfill
17 8 and 10.

18 MR. O'HARA: How much time do you need to do
19 it justice?

20 MR. COOPER: Depends on how many questions I
21 get.

22 MR. KERN: I would say pile through and limit
23 the questions to extraordinarily insightful questions.

24 MR. SUTTER: Are there any other kind?

25 MR. LANDIS: Landfill 8 and Landfill 10 are

Page 59

1 these landfills that were created by the Army are. But
2 the Army did a Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study
3 of those landfills in the 92/93 timeframe. And the Army
4 and DTSC signed off on a ROD, Record of Decision, which
5 is the same as a RAP. We call them RAPs now. There you
6 have what the 1995 ROD says for Landfill 8 and Landfill
7 10.

8 So that's the ROD remedies right now for Landfill 8 is
9 basically monitor groundwater for five years and then
10 kind of check in, look at the groundwater monitoring
11 data and decide what's appropriate then. And for
12 Landfill 10, the remedy is to take some additional soil
13 samples, check for soil COCs, Contaminants of Concern,
14 contaminants above our cleanup levels, and check to see
15 if there is any residual risk associated with this
16 landfill, and if they're migrating into Lobos Creek.
17 Kind of an interesting remedy, but that is what we're
18 checking the protectiveness of. So that is what a
19 Five-Year Review is.

20 It's been more than five years since the ROD has been
21 written, but it's probably been about five years
22 since -- it's been more than 5 years. But anyway, we're
23 checking the protectiveness of these two remedies.
24 So for Landfill 8, how are we going to do this? The
25 Presidio hired Uras (PHONETIC) as our contractor to

Page 58

1 two landfills that are over by the Public Service
2 Hospital. They are two sites out of three sites that
3 are in the Public Health Service Hospital Operable Unit.
4 The third site -- I want to get this one out of the
5 way -- this Building 1827 or something like that. It's
6 a very small site that's been remediated. The Army did
7 the cleanup. And the cleanup that the Army did actually
8 still meets, to the best of my knowledge, our cleanup
9 levels. So therefore our focus in that particular
10 Operable Unit is just Landfill 8 and Landfill 10 where
11 there is waste left in place at those landfills.
12 So under the CERCLA law, every five years at sites where
13 waste is left in place, we're required to go back and
14 check the protectiveness of the remedy. So my
15 presentation is going to talk about what is a Five Year
16 Review Work Plan; What are we going to do at Landfill 8
17 and Landfill 10 as far as checking the protectiveness of
18 the Army's remedies, and what's the status of our
19 project?
20 So as I said before, these two landfills, one's to the
21 left and one's behind the Public Health Service
22 Hospital. I've got a map here. In fact, if people want
23 to take a look at it after my presentation the exact
24 location of those landfills.
25 The history is the old landfill (INAUDIBLE) as a lot of

Page 60

1 develop a Work Plan. And Five-Year Reviews can be done
2 in various ways in accordance with EPA guidance.
3 One way is you just take it through a paper exercise.
4 Take a look at existing data that you have about this
5 remedy and existing monitoring data that you have, and
6 then decide: Is this remedy that's in place, is it
7 still protecting human health and the environment?
8 The Presidio Trust has decided there is some existing
9 data in place for us to get a good start on a Five-Year
10 Review, but there isn't enough data. This Landfill 8
11 Technical Assessment where we assess each of the
12 exposure pathways to check to see if these remedies are
13 protective, there are some data gaps. We are actually
14 going to go out into the field and collect some data to
15 help us check the protectiveness of these remedies. And
16 I'll talk about what our field program will look like.
17 In addition to that, there's some paper exercises that
18 we need to do. We need to evaluate all of the
19 groundwater data that's been collected to date by the
20 Army and the Trust, check to make sure that we've
21 identified all of the groundwater Contaminants of
22 Concern, making sure that we're looking for all the
23 right things. And again, we'll compare -- once we
24 finish our Field Program, we'll compare to see if we're
25 still in compliance with our cleanup levels.

Page 61

1 So what will the Landfill 8 Field Program look like?
 2 Basically, we're going to do some trenching there to get
 3 some better delineation of the landfill boundaries; take
 4 some soil samples to fill some data gaps associated with
 5 what we feel are data gaps with what the Army did, and
 6 then make a determination as to whether the existing
 7 remedy as it's written right now is protective of human
 8 health and the environment. So I'll talk about that in
 9 a minute.
 10 So the actual details of the Field Program are in the
 11 Work Plan, but I don't want to go into a lot of detail
 12 about that. There are some trenches here and there.
 13 For Landfill 10. Basically, it's the same type of
 14 philosophy as we're doing with Landfill 8. We're going
 15 to do a technical assessment and make sure -- assess all
 16 the exposure pathways and make sure that that remedy is
 17 still protective of human health and the environment.
 18 There is some data gaps with Landfill 10 too, so we'll
 19 have to go out into the field.
 20 Just as with Landfill 8, we'll go through the same
 21 thing. We'll do some paperwork also, check all the
 22 existing data, review all the groundwater data, making
 23 sure that we have all the contaminant Chemicals of
 24 Concern understood, and then compare that with our
 25 existing cleanup levels.

Page 62

1 With respect to data gaps that we fill, so we can finish
 2 our Protectiveness Review for Landfill 10, we have to go
 3 out and fill some data gaps. As with Landfill 8, we're
 4 not too comfortable with the landfill boundary
 5 delineation, so we're going to do some trenching and
 6 some test pits for that.
 7 But there's some additional data gaps with respect to
 8 Landfill 10 that we need to fill, and that is that we're
 9 not certain that the current configuration of the slope
 10 is stable in the long term if a serious earthquake were
 11 to hit. So we're going to collect some geotechnical
 12 data for us to better understand how stable that
 13 existing configuration of the slope for Landfill 10 is.
 14 So again, we'll review existing data. We'll go out into
 15 the field, collect some additional data, compile all
 16 that and pull all that together and prepare a report
 17 that will make a recommendation regarding whether the
 18 existing Army remedies are still protective of human
 19 health and the environment.
 20 So where are we right now? We're still at the Work Plan
 21 stage. So we submitted a Work Plan to the regulatory
 22 agencies back in March. We got some comments on that.
 23 We met with the regulatory agencies in August. So what
 24 we're doing right now is, we are revising our Work Plan
 25 and getting it back into better shape and kind of more

Page 63

1 in line with what the regulatory agencies were looking
 2 for.
 3 Also at the same time, we have to do all our internal
 4 compliance, NEPA compliance and archeological compliance
 5 work, making sure that all those folks are comfortable
 6 when we go out in the field and trench and dig around
 7 Landfill 8 and 10. But they're comfortable that we're
 8 not breaking any of those NEPA or archeological laws.
 9 Now we hope to get a Revised Work Plan back to the
 10 regulatory agencies in good enough shape for them to
 11 feel comfortable for us to get out and start our field
 12 program for these landfills by October 15. And again,
 13 same kind of concerns that we have with Landfill E with
 14 the weather concerns. But it's kind of added at
 15 Landfill 10 because it's a bird-nesting area there. It
 16 would be really great if we could get out there in
 17 October/early November timeframe when the weather will
 18 participate with us and the birds are not nesting.
 19 Because Landfill 10, as you know, is just downhill from
 20 a really thick brush area.
 21 And that's where we are. So again, we're still at the
 22 Work Plan stage. We hope to inject some limited fill
 23 data collection activities later this year, and then
 24 we'll collect that, let that data come in and compile it
 25 and analyze it with some existing data. So maybe by the

Page 64

1 middle of next year sometime, we'll come up with a
 2 report to the regulatory agencies with some type of
 3 recommendations, whether we feel that the existing Army
 4 remedies are protective or not. Any questions?
 5 MR. BERMAN: Just a point of information. How
 6 deep is the groundwater there?
 7 MR. COOPER: Over at Landfill 8 or Landfill
 8 10?
 9 MR. BERMAN: Both. In both cases.
 10 MR. COOPER: Brian, can you help me out on
 11 that one?
 12 MR. ULLENSVANG: The hydrogeology of 8 is
 13 somewhat complicated, but the water level in the wells,
 14 maybe on the order of 20 to 30 feet below ground
 15 surface. That may be not exactly correct.
 16 At 10, it's a little bit harder to say because of the
 17 (INAUDIBLE). It's not real clear. Obviously by the
 18 time we get to Lobos Creek, it's fresher water.
 19 MR. BERMAN: What's the gap between the bottom
 20 of the landfill and groundwater?
 21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can't tell you from memory.
 22 I would have to look it up.
 23 MR. BERMAN: Is it sizeable or is it tight?
 24 Is the bottom of the landfill just right there inches
 25 above the groundwater?

Page 65

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think in both these cases,
2 that 8 and 10 will give us additional information to
3 help with that. At 8, there's been very little
4 characterization (INAUDIBLE) and the trenching will
5 provide additional characterization as to its physical
6 location. At 10, there will also be borings which will
7 give us additional information. If I had the reports, I
8 could tell you what the depths were. But I think the
9 refinement of that information will occur during the
10 field work.

11 MR. PONTON: I think at 8 there is a
12 significant difference between the bottom of waste
13 because you have the cemetery between the waste and the
14 water as well. At 10, I want to say something on the
15 other of 20 feet, if I recall from looking at --

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: A lot of the sites are that
17 order of magnitude.

18 MR. BERMAN: The Army acted reasonably
19 responsibly, but they weren't dealing with this solution
20 when the groundwater was in fact six inches below the
21 bottom of the fill.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't think it's six
23 inches, but again, I don't know.

24 MR. BERMAN: If you actually find that the
25 boundaries are -- suppose you find the boundaries are

Page 66

1 much further than what was originally estimated by the
2 Army. Does that mean that we have to revise the
3 treatment or the Plan?

4 MR. COOPER: Not necessarily. It gets back to
5 a protectiveness issue. If we feel that the boundaries
6 are a lot bigger, and because of that information we
7 think that public health and the environment can be
8 threatened by that expansion of the landfill, new
9 information, that would cause our recommendation to
10 change the remedy.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: The converse is also true.
12 The landfill is much smaller than (INAUDIBLE) in
13 Landfill E (INAUDIBLE) But if the landfill is very
14 small, then it becomes very cost effective to consider
15 things like removal, if there is a risk out there.
16 Whereas at a very large landfill, the economics are much
17 less defined (INAUDIBLE)

18 MR. KERN: Any other questions? Thank you.
19 Item No. 6. Updates from Bob and Jim.

20 MR. BOGGS: Just one. I want to quickly add
21 to Landfill 4 and 5. I am going to Sacramento on Friday
22 to get that signed by upper management. 1:30 on Friday.
23 Keep your fingers crossed.
24 Mentioned Landfill E (INAUDIBLE) up in Sacramento. We
25 had a conference call last week. He just got back from

Page 67

1 vacation. He's prioritizing things. Hopefully within a
2 week or two he'll be down to see the landfill and take a
3 briefing on it. He's hoping by early October to finish
4 his comments.
5 I already talked about the contingency at Mountain Lake.
6 LAIR. We had a brief discussion today about some of our
7 comments, and I'll be giving my comments to the press
8 tomorrow on LAIR. That's about it.

9 MR. KERN: Jim.

10 MR. PONTON: Let's see. The Landfill 4/Fill
11 Site 5 RAP. I'm almost at the end of my review of the
12 red lines (INAUDIBLE) that Craig provided me, and I'm
13 finding a couple of typos and things that can be fixed.
14 I'm glad to hear what Bob just said. I've alerted my
15 management that REO would be signing this sometime next
16 week. We have a board meeting next week on Wednesday.
17 That's about it. I've just been busy reviewing a lot of
18 documents. I don't think a lot of you see my letters,
19 but they go to Doug and to Mark and to other people.
20 You all don't get copies, but I've been busy on the
21 site.

22 MR. KERN: Jim does make many detailed
23 comments.

24 MR. PONTON: I don't know if you all realize
25 that, but I do write things. I did have one question.

Page 68

1 Before you said in your committee meeting that you
2 talked about 1349, and that you had significant comments
3 regarding the work plan?

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: Landfill E.

5 MR. PONTON: Oh, Landfill E, not Sector 1349.
6 Okay. I was just curious what those were. That's fine.

7 MR. KERN: Any new business? Do we have any
8 recently released documents?

9 MR. COOPER: I think where we might have
10 dropped the ball (INAUDIBLE).

11 MR. KERN: I just received something.

12 MR. FORD: There's been a lot of stuff that's
13 come in that has gone back and forth between us and
14 Brian. I don't think that many have hit the street.

15 MR. COOPER: (INAUDIBLE) I've E-mailed to
16 Barbara Janis so that you guys get notified.

17 MR. BERMAN: Did the Trust write a response to
18 the article that appeared in the Chronicle from the
19 Sierra Club? The Vice President got it and wrote about
20 --

21 MR. COOPER: Yes, we did.

22 MR. FORD: There's actually -- Mike Hayman,
23 who is one of our board members, wrote a letter to the
24 editor. We have a link to it.

25 MR. COOPER: You can go to PresidioTrust.gov,

1 and then --

2 MR. FORD: No, that's ours. That's the
3 Intranet. I can send you the letter. There is a link
4 to the SF Chronicle.

5 MS. TRIGIANI: Did they run the letter?

6 MR. FORD: Yes, they ran it. The Chronicle
7 ran it.

8 MR. BERMAN: I missed it. I was looking for
9 it. Some days I just can't stomach the Chronicle.

10 MR. PONTON: To get to the Chronicle, it's SF
11 Gate. You do a search.

12 MR. FORD: Okay. If you just search on the
13 last name Hayman, H-a-y, or even the Presidio probably.

14 MR. PONTON: SF Gate will get you right there.
15 And there is a search option, and you specify whether
16 it's in an archive within the last 30 days, or if you
17 have an estimate, you put in key words. That should
18 take you there.

19 MR. FORD: I think it was just last week that
20 the letter came out. It's definitely within the last 30
21 days.

22 MR. BERMAN: Presumably the letter corrected
23 the accounting in the Sierra Club.

24 MR. FORD: If didn't get down to actually
25 parsing dollars and cents, but it did try to correct the

1 revised newspaper list, and then I'll have a frequency.

2 Once I know the cost, I'll have a whole proposal on
3 publication of the ad.

4 MR. SUTTER: A RAP on the edge.

5 MR. COOPER: Newspapers. How many times I'm
6 proposing to run the ad at each of the various
7 newspapers. Do you want to know the cost?

8 MR. SUTTER: It comes out of the hundred
9 million, right?

10 MR. COOPER: It comes out of the hundred
11 million.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: If it's a decision to be made
13 as far as how many times in the Chronicle versus other
14 newspapers --

15 MR. COOPER: That would go into my logic.
16 I'll put that cost down.

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: We've always debated how useful
18 the Chronicle is, but it is the most widespread.

19 MR. COOPER: Or we could just pull it and go
20 with a lot more often in a lot of newspapers.

21 MR. HULTGREN: I just had a thought on that.
22 Would there be any value in trying to get a mention of
23 the membership needs in some of the colleges and
24 universities' publications? Maybe for some of their
25 geology departments or something like that?

1 record.

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: The letter didn't agree with
3 the Sierra Club?

4 MR. FORD: That's correct. It did not agree
5 with the Sierra Club. I think it did make a case that
6 the Trust will have to have some big projects in order
7 to pay all the bills.

8 MR. KERN: Item No 8. Review of action items.
9 One action item for the RAB is to begin to consider its
10 own possible action on Mountain Lake. I think we need
11 to come up with a strategy that looks at all of our
12 possibilities. This thing has really been languishing,
13 and it's time for us to step into that, I think.

14 I think we need to just cover this recently-released
15 documents somewhere to make sure that keeps circulating.
16 I need to put in my Landfill E comments. Those will be
17 coming out, and I'll send them around to everyone.

18 MR. BERMAN: That's on a proposed Plan?

19 MR. KERN: Field Sampling Plan. Any other
20 action items that people have?

21 MR. SUTTER: Craig, when you review the cost
22 for advertising, are you going to consult with Doug or
23 Mark on that before --

24 MR. COOPER: Yes. What I'm going to do -- how
25 about if I send Mark and Jan and Doug -- I'll do a

1 MS. CHEEVER: Are you talking about students
2 or professionals?

3 MR. HULTGREN: I'm talking about the students.
4 We had a student here one night, six months or more ago.
5 He was very interested and a nice young man, and
6 unfortunately he hasn't signed up with us. It seemed
7 like it might be an opportunity for some of the
8 students.

9 MR. O'HARA: He graduated and moved on.

10 MR. HULTGREN: Making more money now.

11 MS. TRIGIANI: Doesn't that run up against the
12 number of years in the service sort of agreement?

13 MR. COOPER: If they stay in San Francisco --

14 MS. TRIGIANI: Then they'll be able.

15 MR. KERN: Anything else on the agenda? As
16 always, agenda items to Mark for the next committee
17 meeting and RAB meeting.

18 Any other announcement before we close? Thanks for
19 coming tonight. Meeting adjourned.

20 (The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.)

21 ---oOo--

RAB MEMBERS

1
2 Jerry Anderson
3 Sam Berman
4 Bob Boggs
5 Edward Callahan
6 Julie Cheever
7 Craig Cooper
8 George Ford
9 Joel Hermann
10 Julian Hultgren
11 Doug Kern
12 Peter O'Hara
13 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
14 David Sutter
15 Mary Trigiani
16 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
17 Gloria Yaros
18 Mark Youngkin

19
20 ---oOo---
21
22
23
24
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

OCTOBER 8, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

CERTIFIED COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

1 MR. KERN: Welcome everyone to tonight's
2 meeting, the regular meeting of the Presidio Restoration
3 Advisory Board. Welcome to the Presidio Trust, the
4 contractors, the National Park Service, our regulators,
5 and to the community members and some perspective new
6 committee members tonight, some Board members. Does
7 everyone have an agenda? Are there any additions,
8 deletions, changes? Yes, Mark.

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: I was wondering if maybe we
10 shouldn't move the recently-released documents. Then we
11 could actually pass them around.

12 MR. KERN: Are there any objections?

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: There is the quarterly
14 groundwater report, which I'm sure people are dying to
15 look at.

16 MR. KERN: This happens four times a year,
17 The quarterly groundwater report. This is actually a
18 considerable improvement. This has all the sites in it,
19 I believe. And it used to be that every site or couple
20 of sites had it its own binder, and it would come out
21 all kinds of different times. This is a considerable
22 improvement -- light, easy bedtime reading.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Trust is working on ways
24 to make it more luggable by reducing its weight so you
25 can actually carry it. There will be some changes in

1 the format to some of the historic data. That will be
2 happening over the next year. It will make it a little
3 bit more luggable.

4 MR. KERN: What other documents do you have?

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: The final, final Landfill
6 4/Fill Site 5 Remedial Action Plan.

7 MR. KERN: Does anyone want to see this? Take
8 a gander at it.

9 Good. Item No. 7 is checked off. Any other
10 documents? Any other announcements or old business?

11 We'll move to Item No. 4. We have some committee
12 business to take care of.

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our regularly-scheduled
14 Planning Committee meeting on September 24th, Building
15 1750. We talked about several very important topics.
16 We had a discussion of Mountain Lake, a discussion of
17 how can the RAB facilitate or try to work out the
18 problems with the Mountain Lake process. We had a good
19 discussion. We didn't come up with any solution. It is
20 an ongoing thing.

21 We also discussed the Landfill 8 Field Sampling
22 Plan. We went over the schedule on that. We had a
23 rather long discussion of Landfill E and the Field
24 Sampling Plan. Doug issued some comments. We had an
25 update on Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 project. George is

1 going to go over that tonight and give us a progress
2 report on that. We talked about membership issues and
3 some miscellaneous stuff. So Our next committee meeting
4 is on October 22nd, the fourth Tuesday of the month,
5 7:00 o'clock, Building 1750. Thank you.

6 MR. KERN: Moving on to the membership vote.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: The Membership Committee wanted
8 to present two potential new members. We have a quorum
9 here tonight, so we're prepared to recommend to the
10 board that we bring Jan Blum and Mary Trigiani onto the
11 Board as new RAB members.

12 MR. KERN: A wonderful occasion it is. It's
13 always a big process to bring on new members. I really
14 want to welcome you and thank you for all these evenings
15 that you've spent in preparation in advance of this
16 vote.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Would anybody like to make a
18 motion?

19 MR. SUTTER: I make a motion that we accept
20 the two recommended members.

21 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

22 MR. KERN: Any discussion? All in favor?
23 Opposed? Motion carries. And welcome to the
24 Restoration Advisory Board. Any comments that you'd
25 like to make on this auspicious occasion? Welcome.

1 Please know that all of us here that have been on the
2 Board for a while know that this is occasionally a
3 difficult process. We're all here to help. So talk to
4 any of us at any time in case it gets frustratingly deep
5 in acronyms or other scientific trivia.

6 MR. SUTTER: Any progress on the advertisement
7 for additional new members? I guess that Craig is away.
8 Is anything happening there?

9 MS. MONAGHAN: The Membership Committee met,
10 and we're working on getting some ads placed. We've got
11 our ad copy written. It's going to be a Bay-Area-wide
12 search for new membership. The ad is going to be out
13 this month.

14 MS. TRIGIANI: On Wednesday we can start
15 putting in the PR --

16 MR. SUTTER: Wednesday we'll see an add in the
17 Chronicle?

18 MS. TRIGIANI: No, no. By the end of October.

19 MR. KERN: Any other committee business?
20 Thanks Jim.

21 Item 5. Reports and discussions. George for more
22 historic and ground-breaking information on Landfill
23 4/Fill Site 5.

24 MR. FORD: Ground-breaking maybe. Landfill
25 4/Fill Site 5. You probably heard me mention before,

1 the RAP got signed last month. Copies are going through
2 the mail. We had a bid opening on September 25th. I
3 think we got nine bids. The low bidder was ERRG &
4 Associates. Basically a joint venture between ERRG,
5 which is a remediation company in Concord. They're a
6 joint venture with a trucking company called (INAUDIBLE)
7 Trucking.

8 MR. O'HARA: Is this the first time that they
9 have done work for the Trust?

10 MR. FORD: No. We've worked with both members
11 of the joint venture before on a smaller scale. This is
12 the first big project they've won. ERRG has done some
13 tank removals for us. They've done some lead paint and
14 soil. I think they're also done interior asbestos
15 abatement. They are a known quantity for us.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Have they been selected now?

17 MR. FORD: Yes and no. We plan to select them
18 and make an award of a contract. I'm putting the
19 purchase request in tomorrow morning, which is the first
20 day we can put in a purchase request for Fiscal Year
21 2003. So once that goes through and it's turned into a
22 purchase order, which will probably take two more days,
23 then they'll be under contract. The train is headed
24 that way. They're not under contract yet, but I hope
25 with a little luck by the end of the week they will be.

1 MR. SUTTER: What was that bid?

2 MR. FORD: We'll go through some of that. The
3 target date to start mobilizing to the field is
4 October 21st. We've hoping to get out there during the
5 week of the 21st through the 24th.

6 The bid prices were pretty attractive. Let's talk
7 about those. The winning bid price on the bid sheet,
8 which included reference quantities, I want to make a
9 couple of important distinctions here. The reference
10 quantity that's on the bid sheet doesn't bear the
11 slightest relationship to the actual quantity of the
12 dirt that we think occurs in both of the landfills.

13 There is a number of different reasons for that.
14 Reference quantities and actual quantities would be
15 different. We think actual quantities will definitely
16 be larger. But basically what we do in the bid process
17 is come up with -- we want everybody to bid the same
18 package. So we come up with assumed quantities for
19 digging, stockpiling and for the different kinds of
20 disposal and ask the contractors to all bid on that, and
21 then make our selection based on who has the lowest
22 total cost on the bid sheet.

23 But anyway, the low bid prices were just under 1.5
24 million. There was a reasonable cluster of bids. Out
25 of the nine bids, three of them had total prices on the

1 reference quantities of under 2 million bucks. They
2 were about 1.65 million and 1.8 were the first three low
3 bidders.

4 These prices are pretty good. I want to spent a few
5 minutes talking about how the bid prices relate to the
6 various cost estimates that are floating around. We
7 need to be careful we don't assume that we're going to
8 get \$5 million and change from our cost estimate. If we
9 were, I can guarantee you I would have already applied
10 to get a bonus based on fifty percent of the cost
11 savings. I haven't done that because I don't think
12 we're going to save quite that much.

13 Basically on this bid amount, I'm expecting that it
14 will go up. Once we change all the quantities around
15 and measure what we actually haul, I'm expecting that
16 the total contract is going to be somewhere between 2
17 and 3 million bucks to do this job. So it's
18 significantly more than the bid prices of 1.5 million,
19 but as it turns out, we think these are pretty good
20 prices that we're seeing.

21 MR. SUTTER: I assume that your unit price
22 will control the total contract.

23 MR. FORD: Yes, it will. We have unit prices
24 for everything, and none of them are renegotiable for
25 higher quantities. They're basically firm prices that

1 hold whether we move 5,000 yards of dirt or 50,000.

2 When we put the specs and bid package together, we were
3 very cautious to try to nail that down so that we would
4 not be in for a big cost increase if the quantity got to
5 be a little larger.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Does the bid include a
7 specification of where they would haul hazardous waste?

8 MR. FORD: It does and it doesn't. The bid
9 package specifies the class of disposal. It has
10 reference quantities for Class 1, which is hazardous
11 waste, Class 2 which is a regulated waste, and then
12 Class 3, which is a household-type landfill. We didn't
13 specify which landfills they had to go to. We allowed
14 them to choose. But the bidders were required to name
15 the landfills they were going to use and also submit
16 backup paperwork proving that the landfills had the kind
17 of license that they were supposed to have.

18 There's only about three landfills that quoted
19 prices for everybody. I think the first three bidders
20 all used the same landfill. Class 3, the household-type
21 stuff would go to Ox Mountain in Half Moon Bay; Class 2
22 would go to Altamont just east of Livermore, and the
23 Class 1 -- and I hope we don't have any Class 1 -- but
24 if we do, it would go to Kettleman down on Highway 5.
25 In theory, somebody could have proposed a different

1 landfill, but nobody did.

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: What was the budget issue?

3 Actually now is a good time to talk about that. There
4 are three different cost estimates or three different
5 prices that we're dealing with. There is the estimated
6 cost that is in the RAP. And the capital cost in the
7 RAP for doing this work -- this cost is developed using
8 EPA guidance -- is actually about \$6.5 million for the
9 two landfills. It's about 1.4 for landfill 4 and 5.1
10 for Landfill 5.

11 That cost estimate includes a bunch of stuff that
12 isn't in the bid price. You have to be a little bit
13 careful about comparing apples to oranges here. I'll go
14 through that and try to make it clear.

15 There is a middle price that I spend a lot of time
16 focusing on which is the engineer's estimate. It's
17 basically an estimate we had our engineers Treadwell and
18 Rollo develop for us using -- the last version they did,
19 they used the same bid form that we put out. That
20 estimate, I can't really -- the Procurement Department
21 would prefer that I not circulate the precise cost. But
22 I can tell you it's between 3 and 4 million bucks to do
23 the work.

24 Then the bid price is the actual price that we get
25 when we put the thing out to bid. The bid prices, out

1 of the nine, they range from a low of 1.9 to a high of
2 4.8 million. There was a good cluster of three bids
3 between 1.5 and 1.8 million. All in all, when the job
4 is done, we expect the price to be -- I expect it's
5 still going to be below what the engineer's estimate
6 was. I would be surprised if the total cost goes as
7 high as \$3 million. It will be somewhere between 2 and
8 3 when we're done.

9 MR. SUTTER: Was the estimate based on the
10 reference quantities?

11 MR. FORD: Yes. It was.

12 MR. SUTTER: And it was some 3 and a half
13 million?

14 MR. FORD: Let's just say between three and
15 four. I'm trying to recall. I have to look at so many.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: What about recycling?

17 MR. FORD: Yes. The bid table include
18 significant quantities of recycling for concrete, brick,
19 asphalt, wood, metal, sort of the whole bag that's
20 typically recyclable. When I talk about how much this
21 will change as we go through the job, those kind of
22 quantities may change because we don't really know how
23 much concrete is in the landfill. If we only find a
24 little bit, we won't recycle very much. More will go to
25 disposal. That will kind of shift how the prices will

1 shake out.

2 The same thing for metal and wood. We do have bid
3 prices to do all of that stuff. So if we find useful
4 quantities of them, we can pick it out and recycle it.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Who decides how dense the
6 material is going to have to be for the recycling?

7 MR. FORD: That will be a judgment call we
8 make in the field. Essentially what we'll do is we'll
9 tell the contractor to start out digging without
10 segregating at all. We're going to say, "Dig it up and
11 prepare to dispose of it." And then we'll monitor the
12 digging and see what comes up. If we start getting
13 significant quantities of good-size pieces of concrete
14 or whatever, at that point we would make a judgment, and
15 the judgment would be made by -- I'll make it in
16 consultation with the people from Treadwell and Rollo.
17 And then we would just direct the contractor to begin
18 segregating for recycling.

19 Once we direct him to do that, (INAUDIBLE) and he
20 has to start separating the stuff out.

21 MR. NELSON: Does he have the latitude to do
22 it here or the landfill?

23 MR. FORD: No. They're required to do it here
24 so we can keep track of how much there is of each item.

25 MR. SUTTER: Do you have concerns about the

1 engineer's estimate on this? It seems like it's on the
2 order of 40 to 50 percent higher. It would seem like an
3 engineer should be able to estimate it accurately.

4 MR. FORD: I think there's a couple of things
5 working here. I think we caught a dip in the
6 contracting market. I don't know if these prices are
7 reproducible 6 months ago or 6 months out in the future.
8 I think we do have a bunch of contractors who are
9 bidding this job to stay alive, not to make any money.

10 The other thing about the engineer's estimates, in
11 the business of digging up and hauling it away, there is
12 always a lot of uncertainty in what the quantity of
13 waste is going to be and what the classification of that
14 waste will be.

15 Engineers hate to have disappointed clients. In
16 engineering, the way that you can make a client angry is
17 to say, "I think it's going to cost \$4 million to do
18 that job." Then when the bids come in at 5 1/2, the
19 client comes in and pounds on the table and says, "What
20 is the matter with you? Why did you say \$4 million?
21 Explain why the bids are higher."

22 I don't think any engineer wants to go through that.
23 Both overtly and I think subconsciously, there is a real
24 tendency for engineers to push the cost upward in the
25 hope that when the bids come in, they'll be below the

1 engineer's estimate, and the owner will be happy. And
2 so I think there's a little bit of that happening here.
3 I don't think there is any way to get rid of it. The
4 only way I know is to make my own cost estimates,
5 figuring as the owner's representative, I probably have
6 a little more tolerance for underestimating.

7 It's hard to do. It's difficult to come up with
8 solid estimates for what it would cost to remove this
9 stuff.

10 MR. SUTTER: Engineers will always estimate a
11 bit high, but I accept your explanation. I think it's a
12 hot construction market at this point.

13 MR. FORD: I think we (INAUDIBLE) manpower. I
14 think the other thing we need to do is sort of hold
15 off -- once we've gone through the process, and we've
16 totalled up how much we've spent, then we can say,
17 "Okay. Either the engineer was way high," or it may
18 turn out that their estimate was not too bad.

19 MR. SUTTER: But again, their estimate is
20 based on the reference quantities and not the final.

21 MR. FORD: Yes, it is, but we'll have to see.
22 Because as the project shifts around, and we do less
23 recycling and more disposal, or maybe vice versa, we
24 don't know precisely what things are going to cost.

25 MR. SUTTER: This is something that you and

1 your crew monitor and evaluate as time goes by, the
2 performance of your engineers.

3 MR. FORD: We're paying close attention to it.
4 This really is some of the first good hard data that we
5 had on what the market is charging to move a certain
6 amount, in this case mostly Class 2 dirt. We are going
7 to be using what we've learned on this project to
8 correct our projections. In fact, we're starting on the
9 process already. I mean, generally it's good news that
10 we have here. It's probably not quite as great of news
11 as it seems to be at first glance. But the fact of the
12 matter is the bid prices are pretty good. Generally, I
13 think it's good news.

14 MR. NELSON: This isn't the first time we've
15 seen this phenomenon (INAUDIBLE).

16 MR. FORD: I can tell you I've already
17 developed a pretty firm rule of thumb, and that is, if
18 you look at the entire remediation program, and look at
19 the estimate that EKI did in 1999 when the Trust was
20 being set up, I think they have underestimated the
21 engineering costs for most projects and they've
22 overestimated the contracting cost. I think
23 proportionately, the overestimates on the contracting is
24 bigger. But what it means in the long term, I think
25 it's good news. We may have enough money to get

1 everything done that we need to do.

2 MR. SUTTER: It sounds like a traditional
3 firm. (INAUDIBLE)

4 MR. FORD: (INAUDIBLE) Obviously, you've been
5 there, done that. We're trying to watch it as we go
6 along. We are going to be developing our own kind of
7 correction factors. Next time we get an engineer's
8 estimate, we can look at it and say, "The last three
9 times we did this, it shook out a different way." We
10 have to have an engineer's estimate. You sort of to
11 have to have a number to hang your hat on and keep
12 marching along. As you know from doing big contracting
13 jobs, sometimes the engineer's estimate bears only a
14 tenuous relationship to the cost of what actually gets
15 done.

16 MR. BERMAN: If you look at the unit cost,
17 it's independent of volume. And so you've got three
18 classes that you're dealing with. If you look at the
19 engineer's unit cost for the three classes and the
20 bidder's unit cost, is this 40 percent accurately
21 reflected in those -- this is now independent of the
22 volume. This is basically where engineering is supposed
23 to be pretty good. You're not talking now about
24 (INAUDIBLE) not knowing how much is Class 2 and how much
25 Class 1 cost, the unit cost for each one of those three.

1 MR. FORD: Actually I can talk about some of
2 the costs we've seen. The bid price for Class 3
3 disposal -- I think the least-contaminated soil -- is
4 about spot on. The engineer's estimate uses 25 or 28
5 bucks a yard. We've been quoted a price of 26. The
6 biggest single difference is in Class 2 disposal. I
7 know in the 1999 EKI estimates, I believe they estimated
8 Class 2 disposal at \$60 a ton. More recently, I think
9 Treadwell has been using estimates of 35 to 40 dollars a
10 ton. The winning bid price is \$25.73 cents a ton. It's
11 less than half what the estimate that EKI was using in
12 1999, and it's two-thirds of what more recent estimates
13 are.

14 I'd also point out before we go whack Treadwell on
15 the head with a stick for overestimating the cost, I
16 think for the Class 2 disposal on the Skeet Range
17 Project, they were estimating 40 bucks. And I think the
18 bid price was about \$42 a ton. I think a huge part of
19 the difference is the result of the temporary market
20 condition that we luckily kind of walked into.

21 That's why I think we need to be careful as we start
22 projecting costs into the future. I want to be very
23 careful because if we look at a landfill that we're
24 going to dig up in 2007, I think it would not be prudent
25 to figure that we could dispose of Class 2 waste at \$26

1 a ton. I think \$35 or \$40 a ton is probably a more
2 realistic long-term price for that.

3 The one other price classification was Class
4 Non-Refra (PHONETIC) California Hazardous Waste. The
5 winner actually had the lowest prices that I've seen.
6 I'm told it's about \$175 a ton. Usually those prices
7 for that are about 250 a ton or something like that
8 when you add in characterization and all the other stuff
9 that goes with it.

10 I'm not quite sure how these guys got their price
11 down that low. I've wondered if I should make more
12 detailed inquiries to make sure there isn't something
13 missing there. I'm hoping with this project, we expect
14 to have little or no Class 1 waste. I'm hoping that the
15 bid price for Class 1 is almost a moot point. It's a
16 lower number than I've ever seen.

17 MR. BERMAN: This way you get some idea of
18 their stay-alive price and they're full-market price
19 with profit. If their profit is somewhere (INAUDIBLE)
20 between 26 and 42, right?

21 MR. FORD: That may not all go to the
22 contractor. I think some of the disposal prices -- in
23 order to get a \$25.70 -- that's for hauling and
24 disposing. So the landfill must have quoted a very low
25 disposal fee. I pay more than \$26 a ton just to get the

1 waste into the landfill as a gate fee.

2 MR. BERMAN: Are you sure that the low bidder
3 included the actual cost?

4 MR. FORD: Yeah. The interesting thing is the
5 low bidder, they are well known around town, and they
6 don't have a reputation as being people who submit a
7 preposterously low bid and then jack it up. They have a
8 decent reputation for doing what they said they would
9 do.

10 My view of this is that these are very low bid
11 prices. When you get really low prices like that there
12 is always going to be upward pressure. The contractor
13 is going to be looking for any change that he can
14 exploit and get some more money. The winner has a good
15 reputation.

16 MS. TRIGIANI: Is the Trust required by law to
17 take the lowest bid?

18 MR. FORD: Pretty much. Kind of our default
19 setting is to take the lowest bid. If we find any
20 defects in their licenses, or if they misrepresent
21 anything, or if we even get a bunch of bad references,
22 we sort of step up the line and go to the next lowest.
23 There is a presumption in federal contracting that we'll
24 go with the lowest bid, unless there is a real problem.

25 MR. ANDERSON: I was just thinking that this

1 might encourage a decision to dig up Landfill E.

2 MR. FORD: Actually, believe me, I'm
3 speculating here. But I bet that Doug already has a
4 spreadsheet running \$25.73 per ton, Class 2 waste. If I
5 were a guessing man, I'd say that makes Landfill E about
6 a \$6 or \$7 million job. I don't know if Doug would want
7 me to elaborate on that now or later.

8 I can do the same calculations myself. I can also
9 tell you one of the discussions that we are having
10 within the Trust now is how long will this dip last, and
11 can we exploit it for any other sites? If we can get
12 prices even in the same ballpark as these, I want to
13 explore lining up a few more landfills right away and
14 try to do them as soon as possible so that we can take
15 advantage of the market conditions that seem to be
16 helping us.

17 MS. YAROS: I was going to ask: If the
18 companies do give you one bid, and then if for any
19 number of reasons they have to raise their price, do you
20 have an upper limit, or do you have a certain safety
21 range that you're prepared to pay?

22 MR. FORD: Well, not formally. The way I
23 approach this is just to use experience. Because the
24 bids are quite low, I expect the cost to go up. Some of
25 it will go up because the reference quantities are

1 smaller than the actual quantities that we'll probably
2 end up hauling. So we'll dispose of more tons at the
3 same price. But any contractor worth their salt is
4 going to be looking for gray areas where they have to do
5 some work that maybe isn't completely accounted for in
6 the specs. When they have to do that, they're going to
7 be looking for extra money. I think the good news is
8 these bid prices are low enough so we can afford to lose
9 that battle on a few different things. We will have to
10 defend our right aggressively and try to control the
11 cost any way we can. Generally speaking, if you're
12 starting from a low number, it's good news for the
13 Trust. I would expect even though the price of this job
14 may rise by another third or 50 percent or even more,
15 it's still a good economic removal, even if the price
16 goes up.

17 MR. SUTTER: (INAUDIBLE) more Class 1 than
18 Class 3 (INAUDIBLE) and yet your unit prices for each of
19 those --

20 MR. FORD: They're fixed.

21 MR. SUTTER: They're fixed.

22 MR. FORD: If we're wrong, if a lot of this
23 stuff tests out as Class 1, the price will climb pretty
24 quickly because we're going from \$26-a-ton waste to \$170
25 per-ton waste. These landfills don't have -- I'm

1 sticking my neck out here -- but these landfills don't
2 look to me like they're full of Class 1 waste. Usually
3 you get a lot of Class 1 waste when either there is bad
4 stuff going in there from the beginning or lots of
5 liquid waste disposal. We don't have large quantities
6 of any of that.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Sorry if you already answered
8 this, and maybe this also fits in with the next slide,
9 but is the bottom line then of these figures you're
10 giving us compared with the figures that were in the
11 proposed plan? I know you're saying there's a lot of
12 intangibles. How is it all going to add up? Is it
13 going to be significantly less than what was estimated
14 in the proposed plan?

15 MR. FORD: Yeah. It's going to be a
16 percentage less. I expect, if we're lucky, when we
17 total up all the costs, this whole job may get done for
18 about 50 percent, 50 or 60 percent of the original
19 estimate. There are significant costs that are not
20 included in the bid price. There's the engineering
21 which is going to be the site investigation, writing the
22 RAP, the remedial design, the construction oversight and
23 the follow-up reporting. That's going to be about
24 between 6 and \$700,000. You have to add on the Trust
25 and the Park Service salaries, and I actually don't know

1 what that number is, but I know it's over \$100,000
2 already, and it's still -- I'm spending the majority of
3 my time on this project and it's climbing at \$2 an hour.
4 I'm not the only one working on it.

5 There is some tree removal and a bunch of other
6 costs that will be added in. I think when this is all
7 done, the total cost is likely to be somewhere between
8 \$3 and \$4 million for the whole thing, for digging,
9 hauling, engineering, and even including the monitoring.
10 If we dig them up clean, we hope that the monitoring
11 will be three years and out. We'll have to see if the
12 sites clean up that way. I would say the target is
13 between 3 and 4 million for the whole thing.

14 MR. KERN: On the Treadwell cost, the 600 K
15 for RAP and that oversight, do you look to that kind of
16 a number for every site, or is that a higher number?

17 MR. FORD: Deep in my heart, I want that to be
18 a high number. This was the first one. And as you may
19 remember, it started out as kind of a pilot treatability
20 study for a while, and then we figured that wasn't that,
21 that it had too many problems with it. Then it was an
22 interim RAP, and now it's become a final RAP. There was
23 a fair amount of wheel spinning in the RAP-writing
24 process. I'm hoping in the future ones they will be
25 more efficient. I hope we can do them for less than

1 \$650,000 apiece.

2 MR. BOGGS: The future ones (INAUDIBLE) have
3 to be part of the report. There shouldn't be as much
4 wheel spinning. I think you're right. It should be
5 cheaper.

6 MR. FORD: One of the other things, we spent
7 some time -- there was a delay introduced when the Trust
8 and the Park Service were haggling over ARARs. We think
9 that we haggled so well that that issue has been
10 settled. So in the future it will just be a matter of
11 pulling up the document and hitting the print button.

12 I guess we jumped around quite a bit, but I think we
13 covered most of the points I had on 4 and 5.

14 MR. PONTON: The schedule?

15 MR. FORD: Actually the schedule is the first
16 thing that he has to submit, and I can't require them to
17 submit it until I award the contract. I talked to them
18 on the phone, and they think they can do the whole thing
19 in six weeks. I think eight or ten weeks is reasonable.
20 We're getting started a little later than we hoped. I
21 would pray for a dry Fall and early winter. It can rain
22 all it wants in January. If November was mostly dry, we
23 should be able to get in and out of there without too
24 much trouble.

25 MR. SUTTER: Do you have a detailed

1 (INAUDIBLE)?

2 MR. FORD: Yeah. We do. I think the award
3 says that they've got to finish all the work within 75
4 days after the award, that there is bid section about
5 how many days (INAUDIBLE) we have one we just have to
6 add it on to that 75 days.

7 MR. NELSON: (INAUDIBLE)

8 MR. FORD: It kind of depends. A lot of it
9 will depend on how those sites drain. Landfill 4 has
10 got (INAUDIBLE) underneath it. The big issue is not
11 even so much the wetness of the site. When it gets
12 really wet and mucky, we don't want them hauling because
13 they'll be tracking mud all the way to up Lincoln
14 boulevard all the way up to the Toll Plaza.

15 MR. KERN: Perhaps for the sake of the rest of
16 the agenda, we should go on.

17 MR. FORD: Let's go to the Petroleum Program.
18 We're still working on the four Corrective Action sites.
19 We sat down with Treadwell and got a brief overview of
20 the initial raw data from the commissary. I used to
21 tell everybody that I thought the commissary was
22 floating on an ocean of diesel fuel. Maybe you've heard
23 me say that. It turns out I was wrong. There is
24 significant contamination down there, but it doesn't
25 appear to be as bad as it could be. Treadwell is

1 working on putting together a data report which they
2 will send to us. After the Trust and Park Service
3 reviews it, we'll send it out to everybody. You can
4 take a look at that. They are also working up a second
5 phase of investigation, which consists mostly of
6 stepping out with borings from the hot spots that they
7 identified the first time. But generally, it looks like
8 there is going to be work to do down there, but it isn't
9 going to be a terrible disaster that we have to dig the
10 whole place up. As they go through the second round of
11 borings, that doesn't change.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: It might be worthwhile
13 (INAUDIBLE) the data report will come out with a plan
14 for a second round of borings. Fairly quickly
15 thereafter, the idea is to get back in the field, take
16 the investigation before doing the full evaluation
17 (INAUDIBLE). But this first data report isn't meant to
18 be a fully inclusive analysis of the data (INAUDIBLE) to
19 allow the second phase to go on.

20 MR. FORD: The four CAP sites are the
21 Commissary PX, the Building 1065 area, the Building 207,
22 231 area, and the Building 1349. 207 and 231, we are
23 waiting to get a Field Exploration Plan that is due
24 momentarily from Harding. They have done the historical
25 research and looked at the data gaps and should now be

1 looking at some new plans for new explorations.

2 Actually, I think I'm supposed to have seen that already
3 but I haven't.

4 1065, the drilling is actually going on right now.
5 1349, they were doing some drilling a couple of weeks
6 ago. The Phase 1, 1349. I guess the data is due
7 roughly the third week of this month. What I'm thinking
8 we should do with respect to the 4 and 5 Work Plan is
9 change that to keep it loose and make it clear that
10 after the 1349 data comes out, we'll sit down and
11 develop a recommendation for how to add or change the
12 monitoring and soil sampling over on that side of the
13 road. It's going to be tough if we wait for that data
14 and try to finalize it.

15 MR. BOGGS: Is that actually the raw data or
16 is that -- we could probably make some assessment on raw
17 data (INAUDIBLE).

18 MR. FORD: I think it's raw data, but not
19 (INAUDIBLE) and not really analyzed.

20 MR. BOGGS: It's not validated. I've been
21 directed by my management to hold up approval of 4 and
22 5. And I communicated that last week. If you're
23 looking at holding up your contractor for three to four
24 weeks because you don't have any data, my hands are
25 tied. It's not my decision.

1 MR. FORD: I am not sure I understand the
2 connection between the two projects. They overlap but
3 the 1349 data indicate that it might create -- that
4 there is a groundwater issue on the 5 site. Can't we
5 continue to pursue that under the 1349 Cap and just
6 redraw the boundary and send it over across the road?

7 MR. BOGGS: The problem is is that boundary
8 across the road that you have signed a Decision Document
9 on is for Fill Site 5. That Decision Document that was
10 signed by my agencies doesn't address petroleum
11 contamination at that site.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it does.

13 MR. BOGGS: It doesn't address groundwater
14 contamination. That's the key right there.
15 Groundwater, we have done nothing at 4 and 5. We've
16 done it all on the basis that there's no groundwater
17 contamination. If the whole remedy selection is based
18 on no groundwater contamination, and now we have may
19 have groundwater contamination, and that is a basis of a
20 Decision Document, my management feels slightly
21 blindsided. I've gotten slapped very hard.

22 Okay. I'm coming back and saying here's where we're
23 all at. We didn't look at this close enough in the
24 first place if there is groundwater contamination.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: (INAUDIBLE) in one of the

1 post-construction monitoring wells, there is a monitor.
2 It's a possibility.

3 MR. BOGGS: There is a difference between a
4 possibility when we have lots of data that shows or
5 suspects that it's not there, versus having a point of
6 data that says we think there's something there. So
7 we're talking about apples and oranges when we have data
8 that says there's most likely nothing there, but
9 post-remedy something can always happen. Now we're
10 looking at 1349, and we might find groundwater
11 contamination at that site. And we have to remediate
12 them on the basis of no groundwater contamination.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: So the scenario basically is
14 that the stream, the new monitoring point, finds nothing
15 or finds something.

16 MR. BOGGS: Right.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: And how do each of those
18 scenarios change the excavation?

19 MR. BOGGS: They change the final remedy of
20 Fill Site 5. We cannot close it out when ongoing
21 contamination exists.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: So if those wells have
23 contamination, then what's the scenario that has to
24 happen?

25 MR. BOGGS: We need as a part of that closure

1 plan, Remedial Action Plan RAP, Fill Site 5, what
2 addresses the groundwater at Fill Site 5. And right now
3 our Decision Document for Fill Site 5 addresses a site
4 that has no groundwater contamination.

5 I think there is a way of having this work, but at
6 this point I was really confused when I heard this data
7 was coming in three or four weeks. We needed to see
8 that data before and there has been nothing happening
9 for a week. If we're going to get that data, I need to
10 know it. I need to communicate it to my management.
11 Otherwise my direction from management is, "Find out
12 what's going on at that site before we can give them the
13 go ahead."

14 MR. PONTON: What does the Work Plan say? On
15 Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 Work Plan, it talks about the
16 data there.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think much of it gets
18 punted back in 1349 (INAUDIBLE) collect the data while
19 it was convenient to do it before the excavation, and
20 then allow the second phase to do that. My recollection
21 (INAUDIBLE) and they were above a certain level, two
22 monitoring wells may be installed there. The idea was
23 that it was much more convenient and economical to
24 collect those RAB samples before the excavation scenario
25 happened. And then the data could be evaluated during

1 the excavation so we don't dig up the well. Once the
2 new topography graph was there --

3 MR. PONTON: I think --

4 MR. BOGGS: I think we should see that data.
5 I think my management would feel more comfortable seeing
6 it. They're going to come up with that question. Why
7 didn't they get it under 24-hour turnaround?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it would be
9 worthwhile for a group to meet and talk about this later
10 this week. Set up a time to talk about it. In the
11 meantime, George can reflect and talk with Treadwell and
12 Rollo to see what opportunities exist to get the data
13 before three or four weeks and work through in a more
14 focused scenario what needs to be done. I think we all
15 have the same goal.

16 MR. BOGGS: In the field, I saw it's not going
17 to affect our remedy. I'm sorry to come down a little
18 hard. I got slapped pretty hard from my management for
19 this. So I need to pass it along to dot our I's and
20 cross our T's.

21 MR. FORD: I'll find out tomorrow morning how
22 (INAUDIBLE)

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Maybe at the break we can get
24 our calendars and fix a time to talk.

25 MR. KERN: Will some of us have to get slapped

1 around too, or will it just stop with you guys?

2 MR. NELSON: We'll go down the table like the
3 wave.

4 MR. KERN: Well, the less slapping the better.

5 MR. FORD: Okay. Mini-CAP investigation of
6 Building 100 to 104.

7 MS. BLUM: What's a CAP?

8 MR. FORD: When you see CAP in all caps like
9 that, it's not a cover. It's a Corrective Action Plan,
10 which is what we call the Cleanup Plan at a petroleum
11 site where groundwater has been affected.

12 MR. NELSON: As opposed to a mini-CAP that
13 (INAUDIBLE)

14 MR. FORD: The mini-CAPS, they're sort of an
15 assumption that there is only soil contamination and the
16 groundwater hasn't been affected. Usually part of the
17 scope of investigating the mini-CAP site is confirming
18 that groundwater was not affected.

19 MS. TRIGIANI: Those are occupied right now?

20 MR. NELSON: 103 has some tenants. There is
21 quite a bit of empty space. If you'd like to lease
22 some, I can give you a phone number of someone to talk
23 to.

24 Okay. A few other things. The petroleum plan and
25 the summary table was supposed to be final and handed

1 out at this meeting, but it's still being hammered on.
2 We're going to send it to the Park Service by the end of
3 this week. I don't want to say any more dates when it's
4 going to be handed out. The good news is that it does
5 exist, but it's not final.

6 We pulled some tanks out on the bluff above Battery
7 Chamberlain last month. This is a view of one of the
8 tanks. It's a diesel tank. It's not really that close
9 to any other buildings. We have some suspicion that
10 they may be related to a radar station that used to be
11 out there that was not put on the map specifically so it
12 would be difficult to locate.

13 MS. TRIGIANI: Why did the radar station need
14 that for fuel?

15 MR. FORD: You can see the tank. It's about a
16 thousand-gallon tank. They put in a couple of hundred
17 pounds of dry ice in the tank to replace all the
18 flammable vapors.

19 There actually was a lot of hand digging to expose
20 these things. It was on a fairly steep hillside. I
21 think that shovel there is to show that the hole is
22 about 5 and a half to 6 feet deep. You can actually see
23 the top of the tank exposed, poking out of the sand.

24 Next slide. This is how they got it out. They
25 struck some holes on top of it, chained it up and

1 dragged it up the hill. That's when they were getting
2 closer to the top of the hill.

3 MS. TRIGIANI: What kind were they?

4 MR. FORD: One was gasoline and one was
5 diesel. These are all pictures of the diesel tank, but
6 we had to take the liquid out of them. We still had a
7 few hundred gallons of fuel. And that's loading it up
8 onto the truck, up on Lincoln Boulevard.

9 The Skeet Range Cleanup. We had an internal draft
10 from Treadwell that the Trust and the Park Service
11 reviewed. It needed some more work, so we sent it back.
12 Treadwell is working on it, and we should be seeing that
13 within a week or two. If it's good enough, we will
14 circulate it for everybody to look at.

15 We're roughly in the same spot with the Fill Site 7
16 and Building 900 Area Closure Report. We've gone
17 through one round of review with the consultant.
18 They've made some changes and sent us back another draft
19 which we're looking at.

20 The DEH Operating Unit is Directory of Engineering
21 and Housing. In the real world, what it was was a bunch
22 of the buildings that were down on the east end of
23 Crissy Field. The Army had some buildings and shops
24 down there. They spilled some things on the ground and
25 they were cleaned up as far as the early Crissy Field

1 clean up.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: The RAP was signed in '97.

3 MR. FORD: Anyhow, that cleanup was done. The
4 monitoring has gone on for a few years, and we think
5 that site is ready to be closed out. We have a draft
6 report.

7 As far as closing out the rest of the Crissy Field
8 cleanup, Crissy Field was kind of a complicated job
9 because the way the Army went about it. The Trust has
10 inherited the job of closing it out. To do that, we
11 have to get closure on a number of individual sites
12 within Crissy Field. We have a strategy to do that. We
13 figured out how the documents need to be split up and
14 which document needs to cover what area.

15 We're having a quarterly meeting next Tuesday with
16 Bob and Jim. And what we want to do, among other
17 things, is present our strategy for how we think that
18 site ought to be closed out. Get the regulators
19 thinking about what they would like to see as far as
20 closure on that site.

21 Next slide. Lead paints in soil. We have a second
22 internal draft. LBP is lead-based paint. If you're
23 coming to these meetings, we're always talking about
24 lead in the drip lines in the soil and around the
25 outside of the buildings. Lead paint inside the

1 buildings is handled through a different group in the
2 Trust. Generally, when we talk about lead paint in the
3 soils, it's the stuff that's washed off outside of the
4 building and got stuck in the soil within about 5 feet
5 of the wall.

6 We had a first draft of the lead-based paint on the
7 Soil Work Plan. We made some comments and the
8 consultants are working on improving it. This kind of
9 gives you a general idea of a level of effort. We think
10 there's about 770 buildings that are actual real
11 buildings, not county well houses and things like that
12 that are too small.

13 Roughly 30 percent, which is about 230, have already
14 been sampled, either by the Army or the Trust.
15 Generally speaking, about half of the buildings flunked,
16 which means we have to do some cleanup in the drip line
17 area. And out of the ones that have been sampled and
18 that flunked, we've done about 75 of them already. Work
19 is going slowly, but we're trying to not go too far
20 along until we get the Lead-based Paint Plan approved so
21 we make sure all of the work is done by the book.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Are the buildings that flunked
23 are the ones that were (INAUDIBLE) and the others were
24 brick?

25 MR. FORD: I don't know. I would have to

1 check with Nina Larson to find out.

2 MR. ANDERSON: The age of the building?

3 MR. FORD: I think that there's a lot of
4 different factors. I do know that some brick buildings
5 flunked presumably because of the painted eaves and
6 window frames and porches and stuff like that. I don't
7 know. I'm not sure if there is any correlation between
8 certain building types passing more often.

9 MR. SUTTER: How is the 30 percent level
10 arrived at?

11 MR. FORD: It's a work in progress. We're
12 going to keep going through and sample all of them
13 eventually. I think probably the more important thing
14 to remember is that right now about half of them are
15 flunking. If that fraction holds true, we should
16 eventually do a clean up on roughly 350, 400 buildings,
17 something like that. If we've done 35 already, we're
18 10 percent of the way through.

19 Next slide. The LAIR and Letterman site. We issued
20 what we hope is a final report that includes a response
21 to comments addressing Jim's and Bob's comments. We
22 sent that out. It's working its way through the system.
23 There are noises within the Trust and the hope is to try
24 to actually close the deal and get something going on
25 that site within the next month or so. We're crossing

1 our fingers and hoping to see some activity over there.
2 I think that's the last slide for me.

3 MR. NELSON: You might have a few more after,
4 but I'm jumping in for four slides here.

5 Okay. Other CERCLA. Landfill E Field
6 investigation, project that I've been working on a lot
7 lately. We had a Field Sampling Plan that was issued.
8 We received some comments from the Regional Board and
9 the RAB. We received draft comments from DTSC primarily
10 from their landfill engineer in Sacramento who came out
11 today and took some time to meet with the Trust, DTSC,
12 NPS, RAB member Doug Kern, and two of our consultants
13 who are working on the project, (INAUDIBLE) and
14 Associates and Erler & Kalinowski. And we talked
15 through Ron's comments and clarified some issues and got
16 some additional guidance and information. So we're
17 going to be finalizing that Field Sampling Plan within
18 the next say 20 days or so and issuing it so that we can
19 get out in the field and do the work starting
20 approximately November 4th. Any questions on Landfill
21 E?

22 MR. BERMAN: Any significant comments made by
23 Ron about the plan?

24 MR. NELSON: I wouldn't say there were any
25 deal breakers. His comments were all fair. The

1 clarification (INAUDIBLE) he provided was good. We all
2 came to a consensus on how we were going to resolve
3 them. What we're having EKI and (INAUDIBLE) do right
4 now do is basically summarize what we went over today
5 (INAUDIBLE) and send it out to all the people who were
6 at the meeting so that we can all see that we agree,
7 "Yes, we agree that the Field Sampling Plan was final
8 with those changes."

9 On the Public Health Service Hospital, there are two
10 landfills that we're evaluating as part of a 5-year
11 review under CERCLA. We issued a Work Plan, Field
12 Sampling Plan for an investigation out there. We got
13 comments and had a meeting in August, and we're
14 currently undergoing the final review of that plan that
15 will go out and be in the field later this month. And
16 that's Landfill 8 and Landfill 10. For you new RAB
17 members, one of them is known as Lower Caulfield. The
18 other is the main parking lot at the Public Health
19 Service Hospital to the west, the main structure there.

20 MS. TRIGIANI: Lower Caulfield is 8?

21 MR. NELSON: Lower Caulfield is what the Trust
22 calls Landfill 8. It's an area where we store our mulch
23 and composting materials.

24 We're also working on the Feasibility Study for the
25 Main Installation Sites at approximately 35 sites with

1 Bob Boggs as the preliminary. We're currently preparing
2 a Draft Revised Final Feasibility Study. We're
3 finalizing the Feasibility Study that the Army put out.
4 So we're working on getting a draft document first to
5 myself and the Park Service for review, and then to the
6 agency and the RAB for review.

7 Along with that, we've issued the final Cleanup
8 Level document for review to the Park Service. And that
9 will be coming out within the next 30 days or less. And
10 then the Feasibility Study document will be forwarded
11 using those cleanup levels and should be available by
12 next year for review by everyone else.

13 A quick note on what that document is intended to
14 do. We're choosing alternatives and evaluating
15 different alternatives from a variety of sites. We pick
16 the alternative that meets the variety of criteria best
17 and that is what we put forth as the preferred
18 alternative. It's a project that's been going on for a
19 couple of years now.

20 Mark mentioned Mountain Lake. We're happy to hear
21 that we're currently working on a preliminary Remedial
22 Design for that site and we have a task force
23 (INAUDIBLE) one of our consultants. The first task of
24 that task force is to prepare a data gap memorandum
25 basically summarizing what they feel are all the data

1 gaps, prepare the design, and how they intend to fill
2 them through the design and investigation process.

3 The contractor currently stipulates it will be about
4 ten weeks to get that done before it gets to the Park
5 Service and the Trust. That will put it around early or
6 mid-December.

7 MR. BOGGS: Is that considered as one of the
8 sites of the (INAUDIBLE)?

9 MR. NELSON: Yes. After we're done with the
10 data gaps memo, (INAUDIBLE) so that will get us to a
11 point where if we have to engage in discussion with
12 Caltrans, we'll have a little bit more solid idea from a
13 design perspective how much it's going to cost to do
14 this.

15 MR. O'HARA: Chris, does your remedial design
16 include diverting runoff from Highway 1?

17 MR. NELSON: It does not. However, I know
18 that's an issue that we need to take up. That's
19 something we need to work out with CalTrans so that
20 obviously we don't have to dig up contaminated sites
21 from Mountain Lake in the future.

22 MR. BOGGS: In our legal discussions, those
23 diversions from Highway 1 are Caltrans property.
24 Technically we should not have sampled those inlets
25 without permission from Caltrans. We did. We have the

1 date. But to touch those, to move them, it's Caltrans
2 property. So we do have to go through Caltrans to do
3 that.

4 MR. O'HARA: Their property is contaminating
5 property that is not theirs.

6 MR. BOGGS: First we have to get them to agree
7 to that.

8 MR. NELSON: Is it you and me that drive a car
9 with lead gas in it that is responsible for the
10 contamination?

11 MR. O'HARA: I understand that. But as a
12 practical matter, can't your agency require Caltrans to
13 do something to prevent further contamination, off-site
14 contamination from a Caltrans property?

15 MR. BOGGS: The contamination we're being
16 forced to deal with here is lead, and that lead most
17 likely came from lead in gasoline, leaded gasoline,
18 that's not being produced any more. So presumably that
19 contamination is not ongoing.

20 There is a couple of fine nuances within the legal
21 system that our lawyers want to push back and forth.
22 But at this point they're permitted to allow discharge
23 from roadways throughout the state. Stormwater runoff
24 throughout the state on every roadway has essentially
25 the same thing. It's going to run off into every ditch

1 along the state. So anything that we try to impose here
2 has got to be consistent with what's being done in the
3 United States.

4 We may have a unique situation from the habitat we
5 have at Mountain Lake, and that's what our lawyers want
6 to pursue to have them do something. At this point,
7 they are permitted to allow stormwater to run off their
8 roadways into normal water collection areas.

9 MR. O'HARA: Is there any asbestos
10 contamination in the results?

11 MR. BOGGS: None that we can necessarily link
12 to cars or to Caltrans. The serpentinite is extremely
13 high -- I mean asbestos -- whether it's wind blown, dust
14 or brake pads.

15 MR. O'HARA: That's what I thought.

16 MR. PONTON: It's my understanding that
17 CalTrans (INAUDIBLE) by the Water Board NPDES permits.
18 There are sensitive areas like Lake Tahoe where they're
19 not allowed to (INAUDIBLE). There is a push to work
20 with Caltrans and work with municipalities rather than a
21 stormdrain system that would use grassy swales to allow
22 infiltration.

23 Marin is making some progress in that direction in
24 terms of stormwater retention so that you can retain --
25 you can slow down the velocity, remove down the coarse

1 materials and allow some natural filtration of soil
2 before you go to a direct discharge. So they do operate
3 under NPDES permits.

4 The Bay Bridge will have specifics for all that.
5 That's something that we all have to look at in terms of
6 Mountain Lake.

7 But it's reasonable that they somehow have to
8 control their stormwater, and the process has evolved
9 over time. The practicality of that hasn't caught up
10 yet with safeguards. People are trying to work in that
11 direction. It's a new concern. Here maybe if we
12 diverted the stormdrain system in the city and divert it
13 away from the lake -- but that's the type of permit that
14 Bob is talking about. It's an NPDES permit. Industrial
15 complexes have to meet discharge requirements, and those
16 permits list those requirements. I don't know all the
17 specifics. Most people have very strict limitations of
18 what they can discharge.

19 All the NPDES permits are being challenged now in
20 court, and we're being challenged by Tosco and by lots
21 of major municipalities and refineries and corporations
22 that are coming up for renewal because of the whole
23 understanding now that the Bay is impaired by certain
24 chemicals and those have to be reduced. So rather than
25 a concentration (INAUDIBLE) everybody is assigned how

1 much they can contribute. Some people are saying that
2 that will put them out of business if they don't get
3 that allowance.

4 There is a lot of issues. There is natural
5 geological conditions and things like that; mine waste
6 which will not affect us directly here, but they do
7 under the Bay: PCBs, copper, and other metals.

8 MR. O'HARA: There is thought given to
9 mitigating this problem.

10 MR. PONTON: Yes, a lot of thought. A lot of
11 work is going into design filters to slow down the
12 velocity. A lot of work. A lot of people. A lot of
13 effort is going to moving it into a direction. A new
14 development plan -- grassy swales and infiltration.
15 It's something we all have to work together on.

16 MR. KERN: I want to head into a break here
17 shortly. We'll finish up Mountain Lake and then head
18 into a break.

19 MR. SUTTER: I'm just curious. You said that
20 Mountain Lake may be a unique situation. I was
21 wondering, are there no other national parks where there
22 are California roads traversing them where maybe there
23 has been similar contamination, as is the case that
24 might provide some kind of a precedent in dealing with
25 Caltrans?

1 MR. PONTON: I can't answer that, but I think
2 there are some general permits that's been issued to
3 Caltrans because of certain of those water bodies.

4 MR. BOGGS: It's that similar situation. We
5 could ask them to divert their existing drains. The
6 flip side is where they may have contaminated Lake
7 Tahoe, there's lots of roadway soil and lead
8 contamination, whether it's in the ditches or water or
9 even on the roadway. That has also been a legal issue
10 that's been walked back and forth. Right now they
11 actually have a special permit that they can take this
12 lead-contaminated soil alongside roadways, and they can
13 use it as road base under a new roadway. If it were
14 anybody else, we wouldn't let you get rid of your
15 lead-based soil that way. Caltrans says the motorists
16 cause the contamination. They're allowing them to use
17 that as a practical, cost-effective way of managing soil
18 contaminated with lead. It's going to crawl under six
19 inches of asphalt.

20 MR. SUTTER: They're capping it.

21 MR. BOGGS: With a special permit that nobody
22 else will get but Caltrans to manage road waste soil.

23 MR. PONTON: That's a reality.

24 MR. BERMAN: If you take the next steps and in
25 looking at contaminants associated with vehicles, tires,

1 brakes, and other impurities in exhaust besides lead, so
2 there's no more lead in gasoline, there is still a whole
3 bunch of other things out there. The question is, if
4 you look at the sum of all this, could we still tolerate
5 the runoff that exists in Mountain Lake, or would you
6 have to do something about it? (INAUDIBLE) potential
7 toxic materials.

8 MR. BOGGS: That's part of our argument to get
9 them to do something. There are trace levels of other
10 things. Up until now, lead has been the largest
11 contributor to toxic waste. But you're correct. There
12 are other trace components like cadmium and zinc.

13 MR. BERMAN: The problem doesn't go away with
14 unleaded gas. It's still there. I guess it still
15 should be part of the Mountain Lake plan to have
16 diversion.

17 MR. BOGGS: I think we're all moving forward
18 in that direction.

19 MR. PONTON: I think the best argument for
20 them to divert, or redirect it from Mountain lake, would
21 be a failure of a tank, an accident, that no one can
22 control.

23 MR. NELSON: Doesn't diversion of the storm
24 sewers also reduce the work of siltation? A lot of the
25 siltation of Mountain Lake was from a construction of

1 the road. Presumably the less solids going in the lake
2 from the road, the better off the lake will be down the
3 line.

4 MR. FORD: POTW, Publicly Owned Treatment
5 Works, basically the sanitary sewer system and the
6 treatment plant that treats (INAUDIBLE)

7 MR. PONTON: San Francisco is unique in that
8 all sanitary waste and most stormdrain waste, it all
9 goes (INAUDIBLE) it's ahead of its time in a lot of
10 ways. It contains most of its run off in streets.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Most of the Presidio is
12 combined. The major exception is the Public Health
13 Service area which is combined flows of storm and sewer.

14 MR. PONTON: Right. The proximity of the
15 combined system of Mountain Lake would lend itself to be
16 combined.

17 MR. KERN: Any other Mountain Lake questions?
18 Let's take a ten-minute break, and we shall return.

19 (Recess taken.)

20 MR. KERN: A brief note from the facilitating
21 standpoint. I usually only make one of these kinds of
22 comments one every three or four years.

23 I want to commend the members of the Board that are
24 asking for recognition to speak. One of the things that
25 happens is over a period of time it's gotten somewhat

1 casual, and people feel free to join in. And
2 particularly the folks from the Trust, it's a natural
3 thing for you guys because you are getting asked all the
4 questions, and you would just naturally speak without
5 being recognized. And I think that's a reasonable way
6 to proceed.

7 But when members of the Board jump in, there have
8 been occasions where other members have had their hands
9 raised and they're waiting for recognition to join in
10 and to make comments. So I would just say that we
11 realize that over a long period of time this particular
12 organization has developed a style and a rapport that's
13 very respectful of people being able to contribute in a
14 very mature, adult fashion. And I want to continue
15 that, and the least amount of facilitation is really the
16 best. But just recognize that asking for recognition is
17 really the best way that we can continue that kind of a
18 good meeting progress. I think sometimes we just break
19 into more a conversational back and forth -- some of
20 that is good -- but also recognize that these meetings
21 are recorded, and that comes from a long history of
22 recording these meetings for the record. These formal
23 meetings are for the record, and they have a lot to do
24 with decisions that are eventually made. So if you
25 have any response to those comments from me, please

1 raise your hand before you make them. Talk to me
2 afterwards, but I think it will continue to move the
3 meetings along.

4 Let us pick up where we left off, which was, I
5 believe, other CERCLA.

6 MR. NELSON: Actually this is George's
7 project, but I'm going to weigh in here. We have
8 another Remedial Action Plan that we're working on
9 parallel. We're also working on remedial design for
10 three sites that we hope to do work on next year: Baker
11 Beach Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6. That
12 work continues, and we're hoping to release a draft
13 document for preliminary review to the agencies of the
14 RAB next month.

15 Also we're starting to have Harding ESE do
16 Preliminary Design and Remedial Action Plan work on
17 Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1 and 2 this coming month.
18 Those two projects are clicking along. Maybe we'll be
19 able to take advantage of that dip in the economy that
20 George mentioned with those projects.

21 MR. BOGGS: For 1 and 2, they're actually
22 doing design work before an approved remedy?

23 MR. NELSON: Yes. It's pretty preliminary
24 design work.

25 MR. FORD: The design won't get very far along

1 before the RAP work catches up to it. The design isn't
2 final.

3 MR. NELSON: We found it's the best way to
4 keep things moving forward instead of waiting and
5 starting the design until after the RAP is approved. We
6 have to kind of move them parallel. At one point
7 obviously the RAP will speed up and pass the design, but
8 we're trying to keep the design as close as possible to
9 the process, and that allows us to get in the field
10 shortly after the RAP is signed.

11 Another project under the Other CERCLA category, I
12 talked a little about it last year. We did some
13 preliminary work, and then it kind of stalled out based
14 on other priorities, which is the Remedial Investigation
15 Feasibility Study for five Small Arms Firing Ranges
16 throughout the Presidio. These sites are mostly in Area
17 A or Park Service jurisdiction lands. But they have to
18 be investigated and cleaned up.

19 And the first step that we're going to be working on
20 is a Work Plan for the actual RFS process and a Field
21 Sampling Plan to get out in the field and collect some
22 data to fill data gaps from the site investigation that
23 the Army did back in the mid 90s. And once we get
24 closer to having that Work Plan ready for release, we'll
25 present the approach to the Work Plan, the Field

1 Sampling Plan, at a future RAB meeting, so people can
2 get familiar with the sites, where they are, what the
3 problems are and what we plan to do about it. Any
4 questions on that?

5 Moving right along, that will lead us to the last
6 slide. The Groundwater Monitoring Program, as was
7 mentioned earlier this evening when we passed out the
8 Quarter Number 1 report. We currently have the agency
9 reviewing the Fourth Quarter 2001 report, which is the
10 last quarter of our first year of monitoring. And it
11 includes an annual summary report. We just released
12 today the First Quarter 2002 Quarterly Report. We've
13 already finished the Third Quarter 2002 Sampling.
14 Quarter Four I believe starts sampling later this month
15 or next month.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: The target is the last week
17 sometime shortly after Thanksgiving.

18 MR. NELSON: That's about it. Any questions?
19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. KERN: Thanks Chris. We're on to
21 Regulatory Agency status updates. Bob and Jim.

22 MR. BOGGS: Just to add a couple of things to
23 what was said earlier on a couple of the slides. The
24 DEH Operable units in Crissy Field as far as closure
25 goes, there is actually a piece of legislation being

1 proposed by my department as we speak that has to do
2 with land use covenants. Both of these areas, Crissy
3 Field and DEH, have residual contaminants that will
4 require some sort of land use covenant. For DEH, we can
5 allow the Trust to stop the ongoing groundwater
6 monitoring, so there is nothing showing up (INAUDIBLE).
7 As far as final closure and sign off, we've got a really
8 unique case here at the Presidio because we have one
9 federal agency doing cleanup in an area that's being
10 overseen by another federal agency, and it's got to be
11 tied to the land use covenant with the state agencies.
12 The lawyers are going to have fun with that as soon as
13 the legislation passes.

14 But as far as the work that's there, my agency feels
15 that it's done for DEH. And Crissy Field, we're
16 probably in agreement with how they're separating it
17 out. If not, we'll work it out.

18 MR. COOPER: Do you have a bill number on
19 that?

20 MR. BOGGS: No, but I can get it real easy.
21 It came about having much more to do with the
22 (INAUDIBLE) sites, and the legal deadlock that we're in
23 that will affect us as well.

24 Lead base paint. In soil, we're looking at that as
25 well. There has been some developments there as well as

1 far as our department is concerned. Sampling has to do
2 a lot of with how you have lead-based paint around
3 buildings and lead soil. You could go to collect a
4 sample, and it could have a chip of paint in there, and
5 that will have the lead analysis go up way high. So it
6 turns out that chip of paint isn't what they call
7 bioavailable. So if a kid ate it, most of the lead
8 would stay in that piece of paint and go through him,
9 unlike if it were lead dust. If a kid ate it, he would
10 get exposed to all that lead. So some of these numbers
11 we're getting around buildings and how they actually
12 collect and analyze a sample around the buildings really
13 affects how contaminated it is and whether we really
14 need to clean it up or not. We're looking forward to
15 that, and we'll probably be able to have it work in a
16 way that's actually more expeditious and better for the
17 Presidio.

18 We're also looking at -- there's a fill called an
19 XRF, X ray Florescence, and we're also looking at
20 actually having that device approved for doing
21 lead-based paints and soil clean ups as opposed to a
22 third-party cleanup.

23 MR. ANDERSON: If you find lead in a
24 good-sized chip, how would there be any assurance that
25 it would stay that way?

1 MR. BOGGS: There is no assurance that it
2 would stay that way. In fact, it would most likely not
3 stay that way.

4 MR. O'HARA: We can go back a step. Would you
5 explain what you mean by land covenants? What is the
6 concept?

7 MR. BOGGS: The concept is say we cleaned up
8 right out here for recreational uses. Nobody is going
9 to live here. For recreational uses, we figure people
10 are going to travel by whatever. If this were your
11 home, we figure you had kids eating dirt in the backyard
12 every day. So for a recreational scenario, we're not
13 going to get quite as low of a clean up level. If the
14 Trust cleaned up to a thousand parts per million lead
15 and that was our recreational number, we'd have a land
16 use covenant saying they cannot build houses on that
17 piece of property until they further address additional
18 contamination.

19 The Presidio is even more unique in that we have
20 Endangered Species habitat. Here in the inner city
21 nobody ever has to worry about endangered species
22 habitat. We actually have areas here that could be
23 redeveloped to Endangered Species Habitat, which some of
24 those numbers for certain contaminants are even lower
25 than what they would be for our backyard.

1 People aren't susceptible to zinc. We need zinc in
2 our diet, but critters are very sensitive to zinc. It's
3 going to be a balancing act on how we say what parts of
4 the Presidio are unrestricted use and what parts of the
5 Presidio are bound by this land use covenants.

6 That borders on these unrestricted use of cleanup
7 levels that we're looking at. Landfill E, we mentioned
8 we were out there today. (INAUDIBLE) has some good
9 information and we seem to be moving forward.

10 MR. PONTON: I also was included in today's
11 meeting. And I think for my comments on Landfill E, I
12 think they were properly addressed. And I think there's
13 going to be a little bit more evaluation.

14 I had three comments. I wanted to see a groundwater
15 well upgrade into the landfill, maybe additional
16 transverses, seismically tied (INAUDIBLE), and then a
17 third comment, head space monitoring of the existing
18 wells (INAUDIBLE) to see if there is any methane
19 accumulation (INAUDIBLE) so that we can steer the
20 process down the road.

21 The DEH site. I've reviewed that. We've talked
22 about that a little bit today. I think in terms of
23 groundwater, it looks okay, in terms of the data
24 collected. I had a comment in that typically quarterly
25 sampling means it's done in a sequential order, and the

1 six corridors of sampling that were required by the RAP
2 occurred over a two-year period. They weren't
3 sequential. But since nothing is really detected, it's
4 just a technicality.

5 And then for Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4 Remedial
6 Design, our Implementation Plan, I provided comments on
7 that. One thing that my agency is very concerned about,
8 as well as Bob's agency, is runoff on the side that's
9 uncontrolled to storm drains and to discharges into the
10 base and so on, and the lakes. The Trust has put
11 together some storm water protection plans to implement
12 safeguards to control runoff on the sites during and
13 after construction. So we will be doing visits out here
14 to check up on those plans to see if they've been
15 implemented as they've been described. (INAUDIBLE) It
16 extends through May. So that's the window of
17 possibility where people (INAUDIBLE) The same goes for
18 other sites at the Presidio, and any site where there's
19 a huge dirt pile or any kind of disturbance. The
20 topography here I think it warrants that we are
21 protective of even small disturbances take into account
22 potential for erosion. So that's my bit.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Is this Rom that you folks
24 mentioned, is he the DTSC staff person that was
25 previously referred to as an expert on capping?

1 MR. BOGGS: He's an expert on geotechnical
2 engineering and capping landfills. That's his
3 expertise. It's all he does.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Was there any comment or any
5 advice about capping Landfill E?

6 MR. BOGGS: His comments were more centered on
7 the tests that are being proposed, as far as where the
8 trenching was, etc. He had some comments regarding the
9 usefulness of the data for certain things. He considers
10 CPT data for -- which is a Cone Penetrometer for landfill
11 materials -- can reveal worthless data. He wanted to
12 see some more actual samples of the landfill material to
13 undergo stress testing and that kind of stuff of fill
14 materials. Because he didn't think the CPT could give
15 enough data because of -- his example is if you run into
16 pieces of china or brick -- Jim brought this up
17 afterwards -- the CPT is going to interpret that as
18 something completely different than what it is. And so
19 the Trust received the comments very well, and they
20 agreed to take some actual core samples and have the
21 geotech test them on those core samples on materials
22 within the fill. He suggested a few things to improve
23 the data.

24 MR. KERN: We might send around his comments.
25 Should I make the assumption that everyone would like to

1 see those if --

2 MR. BOGGS: When you read them, understand
3 that they were written to me as the project manager
4 prior to him seeing the landfill. There is maybe one or
5 two comments based on a figure in the plan that may not
6 make a lot of sense just because of the context in which
7 it was written.

8 MR. PONTON: Can I just ask a general question
9 about how the RAB works? When I CC you and Doug on
10 comments, how do any of the other members see those
11 comments? How do they know that the Water Board has
12 issued a comment?

13 MR. KERN: I think there have been a variety
14 of different ways it has happened. It's not always been
15 completely consistent. At one time, we had a ongoing
16 running list of every letter that was sent to us that we
17 would send around to all the RAB members and people
18 could request them. That hasn't happened in a little
19 while.

20 There has also been an effort to discuss
21 recently-released documents, but comments haven't
22 traditionally made that. I think what you're bringing
23 up, it would be good to get that ongoing list going
24 again. At least circulate the list, and the RAB members
25 that want to pursue -- they can request a copy. I think

1 Mark has actually had a binder that had all those
2 letters in it.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: Or we can forward the E-mail to
4 everybody.

5 MR. NELSON: Also at our Library Building 34
6 we have Barbara Janis's vertical remediation files,
7 which are essentially correspondence that goes into the
8 library. It's kept in chronological order. She's
9 trying to sort it by project based on our cost tracking
10 numbers. That may be another option, if people are told
11 or aware that there are comments available, they can
12 check them out in the library.

13 MS. YAROS: In the Trust Building off the Main
14 Post?

15 MR. NELSON: Yes.

16 MS. CHEEVER: I would like to strongly
17 advocate making those available to other RAB members by
18 E-mail. This is a cause I have. One phenomenon you
19 have when you have a volunteer board, it's not always
20 that easy for two members of the Board who are just
21 volunteers who have other things to do to always be
22 responsible for circulating it to other people. I don't
23 know how hard it would be for you to do by E-mail. Or
24 maybe someone like Jim could do it directly by E-mail.
25 Do you usually make these available by E-mail?

1 MR. PONTON: Most of the time I'd make them
2 available by E-mail, depending on the urgency.
3 Generally they are sent by E-mail, but I rely a lot on
4 my signature (INAUDIBLE) comments. I'll usually send a
5 draft form to the Trust to give them a heads up and to
6 Park Service and to RAB members. I'm not sure if I send
7 the E-mails to RAB members. But they generally get the
8 final signed document. We put the CC on a mailing list
9 tag to the documents. By the RAB members, I mean Doug
10 and Mark.

11 MS. CHEEVER: So you can't send the final
12 document? The final document's not on E-mail then?

13 MR. PONTON: I could -- I imagine that you
14 have an internal process within your RAB to disseminate
15 information that you are CC'd on. The RAB is CC'd on.

16 MS. CHEEVER: I'm not sure we do. E-mail is
17 good because it seems like it's so easy, and you
18 don't -- if you're not interested, you don't have to
19 read it, and yet you have very easy access to it. The
20 library sounds great, but if you're working, I guess
21 it's sometimes open on the weekends. It can be hard to
22 get to the library. So I would be delighted if we could
23 work out a way that other RAB members could have access
24 to these documents.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: We could bring them to this

1 meeting and circulate them.

2 MR. NELSON: I'd rather put the onus on the
3 Trust to do it. I'd like to put the burden on the
4 Trust. Unless the RAB feels more comfortable getting it
5 directly from the agencies, we could just include it as
6 correspondence that we pass on, much like we pass on
7 information about documents that have been released. I
8 leave it up to you to decide.

9 MS. CHEEVER: Would you be willing to actually
10 not just say this is available but include it in an
11 E-mail?

12 MR. NELSON: Sure.

13 MR. FORD: One of the issues for us is that
14 there is so much stuff passing through, that if we
15 forward everything along, we might get into heavy
16 deletion mode. It would be easy for us to sort out
17 E-mails from Jim or Bob that have comments. We can
18 forward those along. Those are very easy to do.

19 MS. CHEEVER: I mean substantial comments by
20 representatives of regulatory agencies on things that
21 we're also discussing here that we want to become
22 informed about. Because comments help us a lot, some of
23 us non-scientists, in becoming informed.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: We could consider released
25 documents too. It could be just announced at the

1 meeting.

2 MR. BOGGS: I guess at some point there's
3 still a little bit of judgment when we say, "Okay. We
4 have a two-sentence comment about something that's just
5 kind of a phone conversation that we were having over
6 the E-mail," versus sometimes we submit formal comments
7 over E-mail. Sometimes we don't submit formal comments
8 over E-mail.

9 If I submit an E-mail, I always put a "draft" thing
10 on them. It's not until they're signed that it's
11 anything that's valid from my agency. When we actually
12 submit comments, I try to CC Mark and Doug, but I know
13 if there is just a conversation-type E-mail sometimes it
14 is not included.

15 MR. HULTGREN: One question for Jim and Bob.
16 Are there times when you would like -- when it's
17 important to you -- that the information, that the
18 writing go out to all the members? Is that correct?

19 MR. PONTON: Personally, it's important to me
20 that you all see what I do for a couple of reasons. I
21 take pride in what I do, and also I add value to this
22 group. From a personal side, I'd like for you all to
23 see that.

24 So, yes. And then I feel sometimes that we sit here
25 and I don't feel like you really do see what we generate

1 at times, because you get bombarded with a lot of other
2 stuff. We can work out a system, either where the Trust
3 disseminates the information for people who would like
4 to see them, see it by E-mail, or to all of you, or with
5 the Trust doing it, or we can develop a mailing list
6 ourselves. I would limit it to significant comments on
7 the work plans.

8 MR. HULTGREN: There are times when what
9 you're doing is --

10 MR. PONTON: Normal day to day --

11 MR. HULTGREN: It's not of interest to us or
12 merely important between you and the Trust and not our
13 concern. Then what I would get to, it would seem that
14 maybe Jim and Bob could make the decision of whether
15 it's something important to us that they want
16 distributed. Then I don't know how you do it. But if
17 there is some designation that can be made, then the
18 Trust perhaps could handle it, so we don't get all the
19 stuff that's not important.

20 MR. BERMAN: In the electronic age, it seems a
21 rather trivial thing to define an address as a RAB. And
22 when you feel it should go to the RAB, instead of just
23 sending it to Mark and Doug, just the push the other
24 address, and it will go out. So all you need is to get
25 from the Trust the composite E-mail address of the RAB

1 and put that in your address book and then call up the
2 RAB and click that and do one click instead of two.

3 MR. PONTON: Yeah. I was just wondering what
4 your internal procedure was that you do. With the
5 E-mail age, it certainly wouldn't be a problem. We'll
6 work it out with the Trust Julie, to include everyone,
7 whether they send it out or we send it out. That would
8 be great.

9 MR. SUTTER: I second Mark's suggestion that
10 we make this a topic for the next committee meeting, who
11 wants to get the information and how it's transmitted.

12 MR. KERN: Anything else on Jim's and Bob's
13 reports?

14 MR. BERMAN: Not about the report. I feel
15 this issue of the (INAUDIBLE) and the Fill Site 5 and
16 Landfill 4 exercise. It's almost a red flag at this
17 moment. I would hope that you guys have agreed on a
18 meeting time and that you work to resolve this issue as
19 soon as possible. I was just looking at the Work Plan
20 at Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4, at the lithology. It
21 doesn't show any contact with groundwater at all in any
22 of the documents here. And so I was just wondering is
23 that in fact an inadequacy of this plan, that the
24 borings weren't done deep enough? I see one boring here
25 is 45 feet deep, and there is no contact with the

1 groundwater. It seems to me either that the point just
2 passed over me. It seems to me that it's a war of words
3 without content, or there is something there. That's
4 just really a valid point.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can help address the
6 location of which borings are (INAUDIBLE). We're
7 looking at a cross section. When the Army was doing a
8 Fill Site 5 investigation, they claimed to have found no
9 groundwater. And yet for all of the
10 investigations, (INAUDIBLE) 1349, there has been
11 groundwater in that location. There is even a 1349
12 groundwater monitoring well which was installed through
13 Fill Site 5 by the Army. So I think in all of those
14 cases where there was groundwater observed, it was below
15 the fill contact at Fill Site 5. But the depth to
16 groundwater is highly variable because the groundwater
17 contours are steep and the topography is very steep.

18 MR. BERMAN: Is it your conclusion that the
19 sampling and the borings that are presented in this
20 document here are incomplete?

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: No, that would not be my
22 conclusion. There are additional data that will be
23 collected, and those are the additional monitoring wells
24 that are installed. And obviously we still need to work
25 out the issue that Bob brought out about potential

1 contamination from 1349 which resides underneath Fill
2 Site 5 or potentially resides there, and how that gets
3 resolved and whether that is a Fill Site 5 data gap
4 issue or is it a coincident of the proximity of the fill
5 site and how that fits together, and more importantly,
6 how it's resolved.

7 MR. BERMAN: This site map lists all the
8 neighboring buildings, and 1349 is not even listed.

9 MR. NELSON: It's not there anymore. It
10 doesn't exist as far as this site vicinity map.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: That may be just the way the
12 map is drawn. The work plan does mention the work at
13 1349. So it's not that it's missing from the entire
14 plan. That may or may not be (INAUDIBLE). I said
15 during the development of the RAP, with many people
16 involved, the collection of groundwater data were done
17 pre-RAB and at least, in my opinion, were adequate to
18 make a decision on the groundwater quality at Fill Site
19 5.

20 MR. BERMAN: Would it be inappropriate for
21 someone to comment on the next committee meeting and
22 tell us how this has all been resolved? It should be
23 resolved within two weeks, right?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I won't be there.

25 MR. BOGGS: I'm sure I made it sound like a

1 bigger issue than it is. Even though my management
2 slapped my hand, it was more for not making sure my T's
3 were crossed first. Regardless of what they really find
4 in Building 1349, it would almost be impossible for them
5 to change what they're going to do at Fill Site 5. They
6 may have wanted to address it a little differently or
7 have some other language in the decision document, but
8 it's not likely that it's going to change the outcome at
9 all. So it's just a matter of crossing my I's and
10 crossing my T's and my hand's feelings just fine.

11 MR. FORD: I will stick my neck out a little
12 bit and say I believe that we will have a solution to
13 report at the committee meeting. If I don't, I just
14 wouldn't show up in the meeting.

15 MR. KERN: That's a good segue actually. We
16 come to the review of the action items. I have that
17 identified as an action item. You stole all the thunder
18 I had. But that was to resolve, to get the meeting
19 together and make all that happen. I also had 207, 231
20 Exploration Plan was due. Do you remember that?

21 MR. FORD: Yeah. We need to get it. As far
22 as I'm concerned, it was due a little while ago. I have
23 to find out when we will see it.

24 MR. KERN: I have 20 days to receive the final
25 Landfill E Investigation Field Sampling Plan and a

1 potential November 4th work start. I can just say since
2 other people have commented, I was invited to this
3 meeting today. I went to it, and my comments were well
4 received. And I had a chance to go through all of them
5 so I appreciate that opportunity.

6 We have on board as a potential agenda item to work
7 out, as usual, these comment letters. I can just say
8 from someone that receives them, there are a great
9 variety of these, and a lot of it we actually do cover
10 in these meetings. Much of the information is covered,
11 perhaps not in this great detail. So there's generally
12 sort of cycles, people wanting it and not wanting it.
13 But you're absolutely welcome to have access to all this
14 information. So we'll try to work it out.

15 Any other action items that people noted?

16 MR. SUTTER: An agenda item for the next
17 committee meeting. I understand that there will be a
18 report (INAUDIBLE) for the reporting.

19 MR. KERN: I understand that's coming up.

20 MR. SUTTER: I'd like to also request a report
21 on the current scheduling.

22 MR. KERN: I believe that would be able to
23 happen as well. I think a schedule was being passed
24 around. We can probably talk about costs.

25 MR. DOWNING: Just a clarification for the

1 cost. We're talking about a budget cost to date of
2 servicing --

3 MR. NELSON: Overall remediation.

4 MR. DOWNING: Right.

5 MR. FORD: The monies are all gone. We're
6 just going to tell you where it went.

7 MR. KERN: George, you might just take 30
8 seconds to set our expectation for that meeting. What
9 should we think is coming?

10 MR. FORD: A summary of money spent through
11 the end of the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2002. It's
12 basically through June 30, 2002, along with projections
13 for costs to complete the whole program and a comparison
14 of the current projected cost to complete with the
15 original 1999 estimates. I hope it will be everything
16 you're looking for. It's intended to be.

17 MR. KERN: Thank you. Any other agenda items
18 or action items that anybody can identify? Very good.

19 Any over comments? Closing comments? I'd like to
20 thank everyone for attending tonight, sticking with this
21 meeting, and welcome to our new members. With that, our
22 meeting is adjourned.

23 (Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)

24 ---oOo---

25

RAB MEMBERS

1
2 Jerry Anderson
3 Sam Berman
4 Jan Blum
5 Bob Boggs, DTSC
6 Edward Callahan
7 Dennis Downing
8 Doug Kern
9 George Ford
10 Joel Hermann
11 Julian Hultgren
12 Jan Monaghan
13 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
14 Peter O'Hara
15 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
16 David Sutter
17 Mary Trigiani
18 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
19 Gloria Yaros
20 Mark Youngkin

21

22

23

24

25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

NOVEMBER 12, 2002

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

DISK ENCLOSED

Page 3

1 demographics of the applications that were received; the
2 percentage of those that were in San Francisco and
3 percentages from the outside.

4 MS. FENTON-HATHAWAY: Denise Fraga has been
5 compiling the applications. Once she gets all of them
6 in, (INAUDIBLE)

7 MR. COOPER: I've asked her when she's talking
8 to people -- and a lot of people call -- to ask, "Which
9 ads did you notice? Was it a neighborhood one or a
10 Chronicle one?" She said a lot of people responded to
11 the Chronicle ad. That has been probably our most
12 expensive ad that we ran; probably the one that caught
13 most peoples' eye.

14 I just saw an application faxed today from somebody
15 from Petaluma.

16 MR. O'HARA: My question is for Jan. What is
17 the protocol, if you would, for the membership process?
18 When responses or resumes come in, what is the next
19 step, and how long does it take from here until members?

20 MS. MONAGHAN: That was my question: Can we
21 get the applications that have come in to date at the
22 committee meeting? The process would be that we would
23 copy them. Each member of the membership committee
24 would get a packet of applications. We would all review
25 and rank them, and then we would get together and argue

Page 2

1 MR. KERN: Welcome to our RAB members and any
2 members of the public that are here tonight. Thanks for
3 being here. Does everyone have an agenda? If so, are
4 there any additions or changes? Seeing none. Any
5 announcements or old business? Committee reports?

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our RAB Planning
7 Committee on October 22nd. It was in Building 1755. We
8 had a large turnout. We talked about the discovery of
9 the Mustard Gas files. We're going to talk about them
10 more tonight. We had a pretty long discussion about the
11 membership, the adds. We've got a lot of responses to
12 those adds. We'll be talking about that some more. We
13 had a long discussion about financial reporting and a
14 schedule. So our next meeting is the fourth Tuesday of
15 this month. Hope everybody can make it.

16 MR. KERN: Any questions for Mark? Anything
17 that we want to talk about tonight about the membership
18 or the newsletter?

19 MR. COOPER: Anna has an announcement about
20 how many inquiries we've got to date from our membership
21 drive.

22 MS. FENTON-HATHAWAY: We had 185 inquiries
23 from our membership drive, and 32 have already sent in
24 their applications.

25 MR. SUTTER: I was just curious as to the

Page 4

1 about it and come up with the list of recommendations at
2 the end.

3 MR. O'HARA: The number would be over what
4 period of time?

5 MS. MONAGHAN: We're hoping that we bring
6 these people as new members in January or February at
7 the latest.

8 MR. COOPER: Peter, we at the Trust, we're
9 receiving the applications. We're re-checking them for
10 completeness. If the application is complete, we send
11 them right over to Jan. We're not ranking them or
12 scoring them. That's the membership committee.

13 MR. KERN: Any other comments on membership?

14 MR. YOUNG: So have the ads quit running?

15 MR. COOPER: I think the last one was at the
16 end of last week.

17 MR. KERN: Comments?

18 MR. SUTTER: Would we then wait until the
19 monthly insertions before we begin the process of
20 selection?

21 MS. MONAGHAN: We had selected November 15th.
22 If we have an application by November 15th, then we'll
23 consider it for this first class. Things that come in
24 after that, we'll look at after the first of the year.

25 MR. KERN: Comments on the newsletter?

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5

1 Everybody see the Presidio Post? I did receive a
2 comment about there might have been people on the
3 Presidio RAB list who may not have been receiving the
4 Presidio Post. Were those mailing lists combined?

5 MS. FENTON-HATHAWAY: I can check on that.

6 MR. NELSON: We have to apologize for the
7 nature of the presentation. It's going to look a little
8 funny. We just had new software installed on the
9 computer today, which is probably not the best thing. I
10 didn't know what was happening until 5:00 today. I
11 tried to fiddle with it, and now it's giving me all
12 kinds of grief.

13 MR. KERN: I can comment on the newsletter. I
14 think it looks really nice. It's nice that it probably
15 got much wider circulation than what it did previously.
16 Anybody else have any thoughts on the look and feel?

17 MR. SUTTER: Very well organized. Very user
18 friendly. Gloria's article on Mountain Lake was
19 excellent. Overall, presumably it works for everyone
20 else.

21 MS BLUM: I think the consolidation of the
22 two types of reports that we've been getting are well
23 suited to this particular format, and it's familiar to
24 people who have always gotten the other report. It's a
25 good integration, and it saves a lot of paper.

Page 6

1 MR. COOPER: My name is Craig Cooper, and I
2 work for the Presidio Trust. I'm going to talk about a
3 recent finding of some bottles with residual mustard
4 agent. So I thought the best way to tell the story of
5 what's happened so far, what's going on right now, and
6 what's going to happen in the short-term future and out
7 into the long-term future is to go over a time line of
8 events that have happened so far. I gave a brief
9 presentation at the last committee meeting. I'll go
10 over it again. Stop and ask any questions on this, and
11 then I'll just keep charging along.

12 So the bottles were first discovered on October 16.
13 They were discovered at Inspiration Point at a lower
14 point. So I'm sure everyone has been to the Inspiration
15 Point, Vista Point, where you can look out and have that
16 great view of Alcatraz. Well, if you look straight down
17 that steep slope, you'll see all the eucalyptus trees
18 and all the stuff that were at one point blocking that,
19 or partially blocking that view, have been removed. The
20 first phase, the trees and brush on the steep part of
21 the slope, were removed actually two years ago or
22 whatever, and then they decided to do an Inspiration
23 Point extension. And so at the bottom of that steep
24 slope where it starts to flatten out, back in October
25 all that brush and stuff was being removed. It's not

Page 7

1 part of the remediation project. It was part of Terri
2 Thomas' team. Terri has come here before. She works
3 for the Presidio Trust and the National Resource
4 Management crew. They were basically doing what's
5 called restoration work, taking out invasive species and
6 trees and plants that we'd like to remove. And she was
7 basically going to winterize that area and then plant
8 next winter for that area.

9 But anyway, on October 16, pretty much toward the
10 end of her work in that area, they uncovered four little
11 bottles, 4-ounce bottles, with some dried crystalline
12 material in them. At that point in time, those
13 restoration workers did not realize what the origin of
14 those bottles were. And so as you can see for a couple
15 days they were actually stored in someone's office space
16 until they were turned over to the Presidio Trust
17 archeologist on October 18th. And that's when the
18 archeologist actually started to wash the bottles and
19 really warm them up. She was feeling some burning
20 sensation on her hands, and she realized there was some
21 odor coming from the bottles. That's when she alerted
22 me and the Trust Health and Safety officer who then
23 immediately got the bottles into a safe place. So we
24 got the bottles away from our employees and into a safe
25 place so they wouldn't hurt anybody.

Page 8

1 And then we went back to the place where we found
2 the bottles. In my handout, I'm calling it the
3 discovery site, and that is the discovery site is the
4 place where we discovered the bottles. And we went
5 there and put up some caution tape. And then by the
6 next day on October 19th, we started to put up actual
7 closure signs and warning signs and telling people to
8 stay out of this area.

9 Also on October 19th, which is a Saturday, by the
10 way, a team of Presidio Trust workers walked that entire
11 area and visually looked for more bottles on the ground
12 surface, kind of walked back and forth in that area to
13 see if there was any obvious bottles sitting around on
14 the ground that we would want to get removed. None were
15 found.

16 Again, but they only looked at what was on the
17 ground surface. That means sitting on top of any
18 leaves. So in the area where the brush hasn't been
19 removed, toward the edge, there is still all this stuff
20 and leaves, and no one has looked underneath all those
21 leaves yet. It's just a basic visual scan. We'll get
22 to the part of looking underneath all the leaves.

23 That happened on the 19th. And then on
24 October 22nd, at our request, the Presidio Trust
25 contacted this Army Technical Escort Unit. They are the

Page 9

1 experts in managing and taking care of chemical warfare
2 agents such as this. So they came to the site. They
3 are called to sites like this over and over again. They
4 conducted some preliminary assessments of our discovery
5 site, and walked around with a magnetometer to check if
6 there was an obvious burial site.

7 Now a magnetometer only picks up buried metal. What
8 we found was glass. And unfortunately, even the tops on
9 top of the bottled glass was plastic. It's not metal.
10 But what we found out is through their experiences these
11 bottles are often times -- the carrying case that the
12 military carried them around in was a big metal
13 container. And they said through their experience at
14 other sites, they would oftentimes find the bottles
15 inside the metal container and then buried.

16 So it's one part of the puzzle if you would find big
17 hits of buried metals, then it could be a clue that we
18 have these carrying cases but potentially with bottles
19 buried there. They found no anomalies of buried metal
20 at the discovery sites. They did take possession of the
21 four bottles and then took that back to their lab and
22 analyzed it. Still even though the archeologist had
23 washed the bottle some, there was still some residuals
24 left on the bottles so that when they took that back to
25 their labs, the Army folks were able to scrape off a

Page 11

1 of the MOA." If you read that, it talks about where
2 they have retained liability. I sent them an E-mail
3 immediately notifying them of potential liability.
4 Tomorrow I'm going to send them off a formal letter
5 telling them that we think that you have potential
6 liability here, and you should start scoping out a
7 full-scale assessment of the situation.

8 I've been on the phone with my Army Corp of
9 Engineers' contact in Sacramento -- his name is Bruce
10 Handel -- which I think a lot of old-time RAB members
11 know because he ran the Army's remediation program
12 before the Presidio Trust was here --

13 He contacted some of his technical experts from the
14 Army Corp of Engineers. They came out here on
15 November 5th. They conducted a more extensive
16 magnetometer survey kind of on the same premise as the
17 technical escort folks were worried about, looking for
18 buried bottle containers, metal bottle containers. They
19 didn't find anything. We talked to them about various
20 steps that the Presidio Trust wanted to take regarding
21 site security winterization and things like that and got
22 their input on that. So then they left. That was just
23 a day visit.

24 On November 7th and 8th, because of the pending big
25 storm that was about ready to hit that weekend, Presidio

Page 10

1 little bit of that residual and then analyze it in their
2 lab. And then on October 30th, we got the lab results
3 back saying that indeed, it's exactly what we thought it
4 was. It was residual and breakdown products of a
5 mustard agent that was used by the military in training
6 exercises.

7 So that's kind of the incidents. Bottles were
8 found; the Army came and took them away. Now the next
9 part is what's going to be the follow up? Even though
10 you've done a visual inspection of the site, you don't
11 see any obvious bottles sitting around on the ground,
12 but what steps need to be taken to give us a level of
13 comfort that the public is going to be protected in the
14 long run to the best of our ability about this type of
15 potential contaminant?

16 So what I've done is, our official point of contact
17 for this type of contaminant is the Army. Under our
18 remediation Memorandum of Agreement, MOA, the Army, as
19 represented by the Army Corp of Engineers, the Army has
20 retained liability for chemical warfare agents,
21 biological warfare agents, and USO which is (INAUDIBLE)
22 bombs and things like that.

23 So I've written a letter to the Army now. I sent
24 them an E-mail the day we found out about this saying,
25 "I think you potentially have what's called Section 4.4

Page 12

1 Trust staff and some Park Service staff, we winterized
2 the site. If anyone has been to the site, you will see
3 that we did traditional site winterization stabilization
4 techniques. We put down rice straw waddles, which look
5 like sausages, hay bale sausages. Basically you lay out
6 and space every 20 feet down the slope, so when it rains
7 the stuff comes down and it gets absorbed in. So
8 basically you don't want sediment running off of the
9 site.

10 We laid down a whole bunch of black plastic. It was
11 landscape fabric that the restoration folks like to use
12 for weed control. It also is great for erosion control
13 because it's impermeable. When it rains, it falls on it
14 and runs off. That winterization was done just before
15 the storm hit. That was a big success, in my opinion,
16 that we were able to winterize the site before the storm
17 hit. We also started to construct a security fencing
18 around the site.

19 So that brings us up to date on where we are right
20 now. Any questions about what's happened in the past,
21 before we start talking about next steps?

22 MR. BERMAN: You're going to address the
23 security fence in your next discussion?

24 MR. COOPER: Yes.

25 MR. BERMAN: I'll wait for that.

Page 13

1 MR. COOPER: For our next step, the Presidio
2 Trust is going to construct a security fence completely
3 around our Area of Concern. I wish I had brought a map.
4 What we believe we've discovered in this area is a
5 former Army combat training zone. That hasn't been
6 confirmed, but we think that we have some evidence of
7 that. The evidence of that that we think that we've
8 discovered, and actually where the bottles were found,
9 you'll see some trenches that are about two and a half
10 to three feet deep that kind of maze around in the area
11 where all the vegetation has been removed. And then
12 you'll see the trenches going off to the west and
13 towards Landfill E where there is a forest over there
14 and where there's still vegetation on the ground. And
15 those trenches go off in another area.

16 So we think that those trenches are actually perhaps
17 foxholes that the soldiers used to simulate some type of
18 combat training area. So with that being the case, our
19 Area of Concern is a lot larger than just that spot
20 where the bottles were found. We think the Area of
21 Concern is that whole area where we can at least see
22 foxholes for at least this point in time. So what we're
23 going to build is a big security fence around the entire
24 foxhole area, which is not only that cleared area but it
25 goes into that forest behind Landfill E.

Page 14

1 Bob and I were out at the site today. We kind of
2 mapped out with the guy from the Presidio Trust, who's
3 going to be in charge of installing the fence. We
4 figured out the best way to route the fence.

5 Jan, do you want me to discuss more about where the
6 fence is going to go and how we came up with fencing?
7 After the fence is in place -- we're going to put signs
8 up on the fence telling them what's going on -- stay out
9 of this area, first of all. We're also going to put an
10 interpretation sign saying that this is what we believe
11 to be a former military training area. These bottles
12 were found here, and we'll show a picture of the bottle,
13 and then maybe something about -- a reminder that this
14 is a former military base; if you find things that
15 you're not sure about, a point of contact to call. And
16 don't touch them. So it's also going to be a public
17 education -- not only will it say, "Stay out," we'll put
18 a placard out educating the public about what happened
19 there.

20 MR. BERMAN: Is the fence going to be set up
21 so that there is a trail that goes down alongside,
22 bordering that area, splitting the area where the
23 present (INAUDIBLE) is placed? Does that mean that
24 trail will be closed off?

25 MR. COOPER: Right now we're planning to

Page 15

1 reopen that trail because the upper part, the steep
2 slope, we didn't see any trenching or any evidence of
3 any military combat or anything up there. So we're
4 going to reopen that trail. What we've noticed, we've
5 done trail closures, and it's been my experience that
6 they are a smashing failure. Even though we've had
7 signs up saying, "Trails closed. Please stay away,"
8 they're just on a saw horse. Admittedly, they're not
9 the most aggressive way to try to close a trail. I
10 don't know if it turned anybody away. While I was
11 there, I saw lots of people coming up and down the
12 trails. We believe if you stay on the trail, you're
13 fine. What we really want to do is contain our Area of
14 Concern and fence that off. You can control that
15 fenced-off area, rather than trying to control closing
16 the trail where somebody has walked up and down the last
17 20 years or whatever.

18 We considered trail closure, but we thought, at
19 least at this point, based on the evidence, it's not
20 necessary. Trails are safe if you stay on them in that
21 area. And if we do try to close them -- what I was
22 afraid of is people would start bushwhacking around.
23 Even if we extended the sawhorses across, people would
24 bushwhack around and still try to use the trail in that
25 area. So that's kind of my lesson learned on trail

Page 16

1 closure.

2 MS. YAROS: Does the Board feel relatively
3 certain -- let's assume that people don't follow
4 directions -- because they usually don't -- and go into
5 an area where they're not supposed to go and in fact
6 contract something that is hazardous or dangerous. Do
7 you feel certain that you've got that aspect of it
8 covered? Cover your own behind, as they say?
9 Liability? Do you feel certain that it's safe enough to
10 leave it like that?

11 MR. COOPER: Do you mean just with the fences
12 and signs? I think based on -- you kind of set up a
13 site security based on the risk as we see it right now.
14 We've walked that area. There isn't any visible
15 bottles. The only place where bottles could be -- they
16 would have to be underneath this much leaves
17 (indicating) or underneath soil. So someone would have
18 to disobey the signs, climb over the fence, go inside,
19 and then sort plowing through a whole bunch of leaves
20 and then grab a bottle and put it on their skin, because
21 it's not something that's immediately dangerous, as you
22 know. It needs to be warned up some before it starts to
23 volatilize. I think based on my knowledge of the site,
24 and as we learn more, if the Army Corp does proceed and
25 if they don't, obviously somebody is going to have to do

Page 17

1 some more research about that site that we fenced off,
2 and other sites, INAUDIBLE). If we find more
3 information about the sites that we fenced off and we
4 think the risk is going up, then we'll probably increase
5 our site security for that area. If we start to learn
6 more information that the risk is going down, we'll
7 probably leave the fence up until we close out the
8 issue. But we'll probably leave it as is. I've been in
9 contact with the attorneys on the liability issue.

10 MS. TRIGIANI: My only comment would be that
11 in terms of erecting signs and wording those signs,
12 probably the simpler the better. Because I think there
13 will be folks who consider it an invitation. I don't
14 know how high you're building the fence. And again, if
15 you have the lawyers reviewing the language --

16 MR. COOPER: It's a really good comment. I
17 was really concerned about the whole attractive
18 nuisance. We were thinking about talking about the
19 foxholes, and we're not going to talk about the foxholes
20 on the signs. We thought that somebody would go, "Wow.
21 Foxholes." It's actually a complete boresville. It's a
22 trench in the ground. It's not like it's all that
23 interesting. If they read it on a sign, then they're
24 going to want to go see it. Because you can't quite see
25 the foxholes when you're standing there.

Page 18

1 MS. TRIGIANI: After it has been remediated,
2 it would be great to have a sign there.

3 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. In fact, our
4 archaeologists have already notified me and said that
5 those foxholes are of historical importance. We will
6 not be able to destroy the foxholes. I'm not too sure
7 how. Obviously, if we do clear the area and we have no
8 more bottles and everything is all clear, then the plant
9 restoration folks and the archaeologists are going to
10 have to talk about what's going to happen there.

11 MR. HULTGREN: Two questions: One. Were the
12 four bolts found on the surface or under the soil, and
13 second, are you proposing to do any further examination
14 of the site, and if so, what?

15 MR. COOPER: The four bottles, the way it's
16 been described to me is, they were in one of those
17 foxholes. And once the leaves and everything got moved
18 away, then they were basically sitting on the ground
19 surface underneath all those leaves. And so you take
20 all the leaves away, and they were sitting at the bottom
21 of the foxhole, and either they were on the ground
22 surface visible or just an inch or two underneath. But
23 basically right near the ground surface.

24 MR. HULTGREN: What about the other question?

25 MR. COOPER: Next steps?

Page 19

1 MR. HULTGREN: Yeah. Are you doing to do
2 anything further to examine the sites?

3 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. We don't want to
4 leave that fence up forever, I can tell you that.
5 Tomorrow I'm going to send out this letter. Just a
6 general notice to the Army saying, "You've got liability
7 here," and then I'll copy the RAB. I'll basically say,
8 "I'm going to follow up some general expectations of
9 what I think their assessment should entail." I want to
10 put some thought to that and basically scope out --
11 obviously I want to build an investigation from the
12 ground up, do an archival search, figure out what do the
13 records say of the magnitude of the potential problem
14 here.

15 And at the same time I want them to take a look
16 at -- that could be a long term, months, just going into
17 that. At the same time I'm going to ask the Army,
18 "While you're doing that, go back into the fenced area,
19 and what can you do to help minimize risk in the short
20 term also?" You've done some magnetometer surveys.
21 Maybe you should do some more. Are you willing to go
22 into those foxholes where the leaves are still there and
23 rake those leaves and check? They're not. There are
24 certain protocols in doing that. They just can't send
25 someone in there with some rakes and look around for it.

Page 20

1 That's a little bit unfortunate, in my opinion, just
2 because of the nature of what I understand -- my Health
3 and Safety officers explained to me what the risk is.
4 If you were to even hit a bottle with a rake, all of a
5 sudden, mustard gas is not going to be coming off at
6 all. But the Army Corp has made it clear that if they
7 did take that step, they would have to put together a
8 Health and Safety Plan and a Work Plan and there would
9 be specific procedures even just to rake the leaves up.

10 MR. KERN: I was thinking, those of us that
11 know Bruce, and some of the Army Corp guys, you could
12 either call him directly or get him out there to rake
13 the leaves -- I think that would be a good thing to do,
14 or we could write a letter and say, "Bruce, get out here
15 and deal with this." It's an option if you want us to
16 do something like that.

17 MR. COOPER: Let's see how they respond. So
18 far, they did send the assessment team. I'm going to
19 send my official letter and my follow-up letter. He
20 said he would respond within 30 to 60 days with his
21 official recommended next steps. So let's see what that
22 says. Let's just go from there. That will be a public
23 letter that will be shared with everybody, and we can
24 all have a meeting about it.

25 MR. SUTTER: At the last committee meeting, we

1 had a lengthy discussion about the possibility of
2 querying the Army in general as to -- not just this area
3 but perhaps areas elsewhere in the Presidio -- where
4 they can conduct combat training and might have used
5 toxic materials. Is that inquiry a part of your
6 overall --

7 MR. COOPER: Yes. I'm not just going to ask
8 for mustard agent used inside this spin zone. I'm
9 basically using the term Section 4.4 Liability, that's
10 the biochemical and USO -- if they're going to do an
11 archival search, let's not look for mustard agent and
12 next year find something else. Let's do the full nine
13 yards.

14 MS BLUM: I just want to underline the point
15 that I feel the Army does have the liability to clean up
16 the site. (INAUDIBLE) I think that would be very
17 unacceptable to the Trust as well as the restoration
18 community. I feel strongly that they need to take an
19 active role in the cleanup with or without rakes or
20 safety programs or whatever it takes.

21 MR. O'HARA: My question is directed to either
22 Craig or Bob. Who's the lead agency here and what are
23 your expectations from all of this?

24 MR. BOGGS: We're still the lead agency. I've
25 been in attendance every time the Army came out here. I

1 So site security is one of the issues. Future
2 discoveries, how they're handled, etc, where we can find
3 more archaeologists that are doing this kind of
4 discovery. That was a joke. It is a concern of ours as
5 far as how we are going to deal with it in the future.

6 At this point, there's not a lot of sites that have
7 dealt with chemical warfare agents. It's not like they
8 were extensively used here. I've been doing a lot of
9 research and learning a lot about what can be done. In
10 the meantime, I think the Army's lead time for actually
11 getting out there and dealing with it -- because there
12 are specific health and safety procedures, etc. -- our
13 immediate focus is going to be on security.

14 MR. COOPER: So what I'm going to do is this
15 follow-up letter. After I issue that, if Bob feels like
16 I left out something or whatever, he can write his own
17 letter also. The State has authority to regulate the
18 use of hazardous substances, including chemical warfare
19 agents in (INAUDIBLE) facilities, in fact, more
20 authority than the federal EPA. The state EPA has more
21 authority.

22 MR. O'HARA: My concern is the development of
23 some sort of a Contingency Action Plan like you have in
24 place where the incidental discovery of materials around
25 the park. Hazardous materials or chemical warfare

1 was even hospitable to Bruce while he was here.

2 There is actually several issues that my Agency is
3 concerned with. Site security is one of them. That's
4 why we were out there today specifically. We're asking
5 for a little bit more extensive fence than they might
6 want to put in. So we're trying to find middle ground.
7 I think we're very close. I think where we outlined the
8 general Area of Concern, I feel pretty good about that
9 as far as encompassing a large enough area. 1200 feet,
10 I think it was.

11 MR. COOPER: Linear feet, going around at
12 least half of it.

13 MR. BOGGS: We're working with them as far as
14 what we would want the Army to do, what's expected of
15 the Army, what are ways of detecting these things, and
16 what should they be looking for. We're concerned not
17 just with these types of practice warfare agents. It's
18 likely there's grenades used in these trenches, that
19 kind of stuff.

20 History shows that not all these foxholes were
21 foxholes. Some were waste holes. My boss, if he had
22 his way, he'd have a ten-foot fence, security, razor
23 wire on top and sentry guards walking the fence, in
24 order to be sure it was safe. We know that that is a
25 little bit extensive.

1 agents are not included in that, I don't believe. But
2 it sounds as though you really need to develop some sort
3 of a Contingency Action Plan for this type of thing in
4 addition to the plan that you already have.

5 MR. NELSON: There is a section in the
6 (INAUDIBLE) Contingency Plan that never got finalized
7 that talks about -- discovered some things that are
8 listed in a way that the Trust has no responsibility
9 for.

10 Essentially what happened was I think there is a
11 breakdown in communication. Somebody didn't look at the
12 bottles carefully enough and think (INAUDIBLE) Health
13 and Safety would be the first person to call because a
14 lot of people that do restoration work come across very
15 interested artifacts all the time. The archeologists
16 are very interested in them.

17 But the ones I've spoken with have said, you have to
18 be careful about what you're handling. This is a former
19 military base and not everything is just something that
20 came out of somebody's backyard. But there is a section
21 in the Contingency Plan that we've been working on that
22 discusses -- not specifically chemical warfare agents
23 and specific things the Trust will do -- but there are
24 discussions about contacting the Army, the USO, and
25 other things that.

Page 25

1 MR. COOPER: If you look at our Contingency
2 Plan, somebody has to notify Environmental or Health and
3 Safety. I mean, that's the link that didn't happen on
4 this one. There was a two- to three-day or four-day gap
5 before Environmental and Health and Safety were
6 notified. And then all those protocols started falling
7 into place and I got E-mails.

8 What caused that gap was lack of our own employee
9 education. So our Health and Safety Officer has now
10 started employee training about identification and
11 communication to help close that gap, so people -- and
12 that's something that you just have to keep doing also,
13 because people will forget. Three years from now it
14 will be a forgotten issue, and someone will find a
15 bottle, so we have to keep that going.

16 MR. BERMAN: This area is between what used to
17 be called the California Riding and Hiking Road and
18 another trail that's been in the Presidio for a long
19 time. Those two areas are now connected by a trail that
20 wasn't there until the Trust put that trail in.

21 On another note, for 15 years I walked in that area
22 with a dog, all the areas that you're talking about,
23 chasing this dog around through there. The only thing
24 that I ever saw in there that looked like something that
25 was left behind was household articles, people that had

Page 27

1 like this is a pretty random event.

2 I would say, Bob, that your boss is really
3 overreacting on the basis of what's known so far. I
4 think after the foxholes are uncovered, they're not
5 going to be foxholes. They're going to be places where
6 people dug up and dumped stuff because it was so close
7 to the barracks.

8 MR. BOGGS: I think their concern comes from
9 the USO potential. Two years ago in San Diego, two kids
10 (INAUDIBLE). It only takes one of these devices. As
11 long as that's the risk, they would err on the prudent
12 side of doing what we can to keep people out of there,
13 if there's a potential for danger.

14 MR. BERMAN: But a USO wouldn't show up in a
15 magnetometer.

16 MR. BOGGS: They surveyed an area about the
17 size of these tables with a magnetometer at a site where
18 there is foxholes, etc. When they did the detailed
19 survey, they did find a couple of small anomalies
20 (INAUDIBLE). A 50-pound stainless steel canister is the
21 can that these mustard agents come in. It didn't look
22 like we found this big, huge canister, but again, we get
23 in an area half the size of this room as opposed to
24 (INAUDIBLE) the immediate area of discovery, and not a
25 few acres, not the foxholes that -- when they did sweep

Page 26

1 camped in there for a night, or something like that. As
2 far as I know, the only result of my traversing that
3 area a couple times a week for 15 years is that it
4 affected my mental health and I joined the RAB.

5 As a person that's been through that at least a
6 hundred times, I've never seen anything in there that
7 looked obvious, and I've never come across these
8 foxholes. You have to really search them out. They've
9 got to be buried under debris and stuff like that.

10 MR. COOPER: Once somebody points them out to
11 you, you go, "Oh, okay." Maybe if you're just walking
12 by, you wouldn't even think of it. You might just think
13 erosion gulley or something like that. But once
14 somebody points them out, you go, "Yeah."

15 MR. BERMAN: That area is right at the top of
16 Quarry Road.

17 MR. COOPER: Correct.

18 MR. BERMAN: There were barracks there. That
19 was a heavily-occupied barracks area. The Army had all
20 their rough and tumble personnel living in those
21 barracks. It's 50 feet from the last barracks up to the
22 area where these bottles were found. "Today I forgot to
23 turn these in. I'm just going to run up there and dump
24 them." The fact that the Army with a magnetometer
25 didn't find any large quantities, it sounds to me more

Page 28

1 the magnetometer over the foxhole, they did pick up a
2 minor anomaly, but they're not going to do any intrusive
3 work at this point. We think that that's most likely
4 the scenario, four bottles came in a little can
5 (INAUDIBLE) that's the most likely scenario. It's that
6 little tiny risk that we want to minimize.

7 MR. COOPER: It's a balancing act. We are
8 going to have a community meeting for the folks that
9 live on Quarry Road and MacArthur, I think, one street
10 over. We're going to be handing out leaflets and
11 inviting them to a committee meeting on November 19, and
12 anyone from the RAB is especially welcome to attend that
13 meeting.

14 MR. KERN: Two more people that I've
15 identified, and then I'd kind of like to wrap this up so
16 we can move on. Joel and Jim.

17 MR. HERMANN: Craig answered my question about
18 the education of the personnel there on the Presidio.
19 We had discussed that.

20 MR. PONTON: Craig, I don't know a lot about
21 mustard gas. (INAUDIBLE) bake in the sun, is there any
22 way to -- would it be valuable to get some head space
23 gas analysis underneath that actual bottle to see if
24 you've trapped any gases, to say, well, if there is any
25 residual or volatilized (INAUDIBLE) and use it as a

Page 29

1 screening? What we have out there is a screening tool.

2 MR. BOGGS: In talking with the Army and what
3 they did with these samples, when they found the vials,
4 they put the four vials in a ziplock bag, and they did
5 try to test the air space, but it was below detection
6 levels. They were only able to detect -- apparently the
7 mustard, when it dries, forms a crust from the outside.
8 The inside still has some volatile contents. So they
9 actually had to take a piece, break it and heat it up to
10 get enough --

11 MR. COOPER: Our San Francisco temperatures
12 generally were not creating enough heat --

13 MR. PONTON: That gets pretty toasty.

14 MR. BERMAN: It probably gets up to
15 150 degrees.

16 MR. COOPER: I think air monitoring would be
17 part of a Trust request on that.

18 MR. KERN: All right. I'm going to move this,
19 unless there is any more comments.

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: I would just like to say that
21 in our experience, the information you get from the Corp
22 of Engineers and the Army will probably not be very
23 useful. But any information that will be helpful will
24 probably be found on the Presidio here somewhere, area
25 photos, the record center, etc. You might just think

Page 31

1 middle axis of the site.

2 EKI, our consultant, also conducted a Background
3 Radiation Survey. They went off the site trying to gain
4 some ambient radiation readings so that they could use
5 that for a comparison to reading. They gather at the
6 site when they're opening up the trenches and measuring
7 radiation.

8 And they also conducted an electromagnetic survey of
9 the entire landfill surface to determine whether or not
10 there were any significant anomalies that could help us
11 decide whether or not we should move sampling locations
12 in the field based on finding of some significant
13 anomaly that could represent buried drums or some other
14 significant pocket of waste.

15 So that data is streaming in slowly. I don't have
16 anything but basically verbal reports at this point.
17 But the geophysical survey company is still working on
18 interpreting the seismic transect. They'll have
19 something to us probably later this week. Essentially
20 what that does is tell us the depth of the bedrock in
21 the area. We can correlate some of our sampling
22 locations to that and compare different test methods to
23 what the seismic survey says.

24 This week EKI continued the field work. They
25 conducted CPT testing on Monday, which is the Cone

Page 30

1 about it before going ahead and starting your own
2 investigation.

3 MR. COOPER: I've struggled with that concept
4 also.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Not that much can be found
6 probably.

7 MR. KERN: 5 B. Landfill 8, 10 and E Field
8 Investigation Work.

9 MR. NELSON: My name is Chris Nelson. I'm a
10 project manager with the Presidio Trust. I'm currently
11 working on three major field investigation projects at
12 the Presidio that have been in the works for quite a
13 while.

14 The first one I'm going to talk about is Landfill E,
15 which ironically enough borders the site that Craig was
16 just speaking of. It's down at the end -- it's west of
17 Quarry Road. I was able to walk at the site today, and
18 basically hundred yards away was the area that Craig was
19 talking about.

20 We have been working on a Field Sampling Plan for
21 the last several months. We released the final Field
22 Sampling Plan last week and at the same time mobilized
23 into the field to do the first few phases of the field
24 work, which included three seismic transects, two across
25 the site and one in a length-wise direction along the

Page 32

1 Penetrometer test. Those were five different locations
2 throughout the site. The deepest test pushed actually
3 all the way to 83 feet below ground surface before they
4 encountered bedrock. The southwestern portion of the
5 site is beyond where the ballfield is towards the
6 western hillside. So it's kind of surprising to see it
7 that deep there.

8 And then continuing on from today through the rest
9 of this week, they will be doing additional soil
10 borings, installing Piezometers and soil gas wells and
11 monitoring wells throughout the rest of the week in
12 those borings. And today they were able to complete one
13 well and get started on the significant drilling of a
14 second well. All of these borings are going to about
15 45 feet approximately below the surface of the ground.

16 As that investigation continues on after the wells
17 are installed, the Piezometers are installed, and all
18 the soil borings are complete, the last phase will be
19 the trenching, which will be late next week, probably
20 Thursday and Friday of next week.

21 The two additional sites that I've been working on
22 directing field activities are also mentioned in the
23 Presidio Post this month. They're the Public Health
24 Service Hospital landfills, Landfills 8 and 10. We
25 released a Final Work Plan for the CERCLA Five Year

Page 33

1 Review and final Field Sampling Plan on October 18th.
 2 It's been reviewed by all the stakeholders, and we've
 3 responded to all their comments and mobilized into the
 4 field on October 21st at Landfill 10. That first phase
 5 of the work out there consisted of collecting soil
 6 borings from the slope of the landfill, a very steep
 7 slope. It faces out towards the lowest valley. And if
 8 you're standing on 15th Avenue or anywhere in that
 9 environment, you can see up towards the building, the
 10 Main Public Health Service building, there is quite a
 11 steep slope that's very unnatural, and that's basically
 12 Landfill 10. If you were to walk down that face, you
 13 would see a significant amount of debris sticking out.

14 The idea behind the slope borings is to determine
 15 whether or not the slope is actually stable. It's
 16 testing it for geotechnical properties. Once the slope
 17 borings were done, we conducted two days of excavating
 18 test pits. All that was also to (INAUDIBLE)
 19 geotechnical as well as visually determining and
 20 confirming Army and Trust boundary definitions of the
 21 site, looking at the amount of materials as far as soil
 22 versus waste in the pits and where they extended to.

23 Any questions about the first phase of the work at
 24 Landfill 10?

25 MS. TRIGIANI: In relation to the parking lot,

Page 35

1 clearly saying the parking lot was closed, and some guy
 2 just drove right pass it and parked his car and starting
 3 walking his dog. So it's a challenge. But that's not
 4 important. We were able to get the work done.

5 Now the more interesting work that occurred, which
 6 has sort of been one of these sites where there is
 7 question marks in many people's minds, is Landfill 8,
 8 which is the landfill that's located just north of the
 9 main Public Health Service Hospital building. There's
 10 sort of an upper plateau below the Nike Swale, below the
 11 Nike facility. There's a nice restoration site there
 12 that's fenced off. There's a whole parking lot. The
 13 Trust stores a lot of their mulch and soil there.

14 The purpose of that investigation was primarily to
 15 evaluate and confirm whether or not the Army's boundary
 16 definitions of the landfill were correct. Also to
 17 estimate more carefully the volume of the landfill, and
 18 look at chemical analysis of the fill, both within and
 19 also native soil beneath, to see if it's been impacting
 20 the native soil.

21 And we found the EKI assessment of the site in 1998
 22 showed not only the original sort of funny-shaped circle
 23 of the landfill, but also these wings that sort of
 24 spread out on either side, which was essentially where
 25 filling occurred, but it wasn't clear how much of that

Page 34

1 if you come onto the Presidio on 15th Avenue, where is
 2 this landfill?

3 MR. NELSON: It is the parking lot. The
 4 Public Health Service Hospital had about three different
 5 iterations of structures out there. One of the
 6 structures that was torn down was essentially mixed in
 7 with soil when they had to create a parking lot for the
 8 new addition which was built in '48 or '52 or something.
 9 They took a tremendous amount of rubble and soil and
 10 placed it on this natural hillside and graded it and
 11 paved it with improvements like street lighting and
 12 planter boxes and stuff. And that's the landfill.

13 MR. COOPER: That's why it sagged.

14 MS. TRIGIANI: Oh, okay. More people seem to
 15 be parking there than ever.

16 MR. NELSON: Well, the Jewish Community Center
 17 is one of our tenants over in 1808, and there area few
 18 other tenants in that area. What Craig was saying
 19 earlier about people not following signs and jumping
 20 over fences or whatever, we went through a great deal of
 21 internal haggling with ourselves as to how we were going
 22 to close the parking lot in phases to allow some of it
 23 to be open during investigation. We put up signs. We
 24 sent out letters to the neighbor. We put flyers on the
 25 cars. I was out there one day and there was a sign

Page 36

1 filling included rubble or just soil.

2 On the western side, closer to Battery Caulfield
 3 Road, we found nothing but soil. We know that if there
 4 was filling there, it was essentially just sand that had
 5 probably been graded around to fill a parking lot or
 6 something like that.

7 On the eastern side, however, moving towards
 8 Mountain Lake, we found a significant layer of debris:
 9 bricks, gauze rolls, pieces of what looked like bathroom
 10 floor, pieces of tile two to three feet thick across a
 11 very long area -- over 100 feet -- and extending down
 12 into the southernmost well. So we have confirmation
 13 that at least that eastern side is debris and not just
 14 soil. We're analyzing the soil samples right now to see
 15 whether or not it's impacted.

16 MR. COOPER: Were you able to delineate that
 17 eastern edge?

18 MR. NELSON: We weren't because we got into a
 19 situation where, the tricky part about restoration and
 20 native plants is they don't understand fences. We have
 21 endangered species plants in that area. We also have
 22 native plants like Loupen and Coyote Bush that we were
 23 instructed to protect, which we did. And so we were not
 24 able to continue to the east. We could in some cases do
 25 things like hand-auger down a few feet and find out if

Page 37

1 there's any debris.

2 The other thing you can do is if you walk south of
3 the site, there's a hillside that slopes down towards a
4 residential neighborhood there. You can't see any
5 debris poking out of the hillside. So you know pretty
6 much it probably ends somewhere on the other side. If
7 we needed to draw the boundary, we could go out and do
8 some exploratory hand auguring.

9 Thursday, Halloween, we found a dead guy. There's a
10 cemetery that was placed there, upwards of 500 bodies,
11 by the Marine Hospital Service, which was essentially
12 what proceeded the Public Health Service at that site.
13 We had gone through extensive measures to make sure that
14 if we did find any human remains, we had all these
15 protocols in place. We had the San Francisco coroner
16 come out twice and take over possession of this poor
17 dead sailer.

18 The first thing that triggered it was, our
19 anthropologist was standing on the edge of this site,
20 walking along this trail, nowhere near where we were
21 trenching, and he saw a part of a human jawbone at the
22 surface that looked like it had been basically been
23 pushed to the surface by a rodent. The rodent was
24 traveling around, and it was in his way, so he pushed it
25 up with the dirt, and there it sat, three intact molars

Page 38

1 and a piece of a jaw right back here. So that triggered
2 all of our anthropology people and archeology people
3 coming out, the coroner and the police, etc. It was a
4 real circus.

5 And then everything was fine. The coroner took
6 possession of it. Then I went back to our office and I
7 was working. Our compliance officer came in about two
8 hours later and said, "Chris, we've got to go. They're
9 finding more body parts."

10 About nine feet below grade, which is actually
11 higher they would expect to find a cemetery, they found
12 portions of a redwood coffin, and basically from the
13 knee down to the ankles, almost entirely two legs and
14 pieces of fabric and shoe leather and things like that.
15 I was out there with the archeologist with a screen,
16 sifting through this stuff, finding big and little
17 pieces of bone. It could have been 150 years old, this
18 burial site. The fabric was so fragile, if you rubbed
19 it in your hands, it would just disappear like dust.

20 MS. TRIGIANI: More than one body?

21 MR. NELSON: No. This was probably just one.
22 Possibly what happened was when the cemetery came into a
23 state of significant disrepair -- you can see aerial
24 photos that show the head stones had fallen over, the
25 fence was down, and then the ultimate insult to injury,

Page 39

1 they put garbage on top of the cemetery.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: This is a separate cemetery
3 (INAUDIBLE)

4 MR. NELSON: This wasn't anything to do with
5 the national cemetery. This was a Merchant Marine
6 cemetery that was there. Basically these were foreign
7 sailors whose next of kin couldn't afford or could not
8 be located to take the remains. So they buried them at
9 this site.

10 MR. COOPER: We thought all the coffins were a
11 lot deeper than our trenching --

12 MR. NELSON: We were intentionally trying to
13 stay in the native soil horizon and not get into it
14 because we knew that if we went a few feet below that,
15 we'd probably start bumping into coffins. This one was
16 significantly higher than we thought it would be, or
17 shallower than we thought it would be.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Was it in debris?

19 MR. NELSON: Yeah. It was debris on either
20 side of it that probably had gotten pushed around the
21 floor, like maybe in the original landfill. We didn't
22 find an entire coffin. We just found chunks,
23 significantly splintered up.

24 MS. YAROS: Did they determine what the age of
25 it was?

Page 40

1 MR. NELSON: They haven't. It's possible that
2 the coroner will make an estimate of what the age of it
3 is was and how long it was there.

4 MR. HERMANN: Well, what is the Trust going to
5 do about this cemetery? If you're saying there is 500
6 people down there, are we just going to keep them down
7 there?

8 MR. NELSON: That's the big question of the
9 day, for sure. That's one of the most complicated
10 things about this site is that you have a landfill on
11 top of a cemetery. There's no markings anywhere
12 delineating a cemetery, so at a minimum some sort of
13 interpretation of that cemetery should be put up.

14 But we also found that excavating the cemetery would
15 be incredibly difficult, no matter how you do it,
16 because at nine feet, which you didn't expect to find a
17 cemetery, there is human remains.

18 It triggered a very lengthy compliance process
19 having to do with a federal law called NAGBRA, where we
20 had to notify the native Hawaiian organizations because
21 there was some known native Hawaiians buried there. And
22 it was essentially considered by our lawyers an
23 intentional archeological excavation. It remains to be
24 seen. Whatever happens to that landfill will be
25 evaluated in this Five Year Review, and beyond that is

Page 41

1 kind of an unknown at this point.

2 MR. COOPER: Because that's really what our
3 report is about, and finding this coffin, we thought
4 that our original analysis is that we could maybe remove
5 the landfill cleanly and not disturb the cemetery.
6 Running into a coffin at nine feet is calling into
7 question whether that can really be done. So that
8 information will get taken into account when we do our
9 Five Year Review and we figure out what our next steps
10 are going to be (INAUDIBLE).

11 MR. PONTON: Is it that the coffin is shallow
12 or the fill is shallow? Was the coffin placed at six
13 feet and there's only three feet of fill, or --

14 MR. NELSON: No. I think the coffin was
15 probably crushed and moved around in the landfilling. I
16 don't think that we can find the landfill in that
17 location. I don't think we'd find the bottom of the
18 landfill in that location at six feet and then a grave
19 another six feet down. I think this was probably just
20 some disturbance that occurred as the landfilling
21 occurred.

22 MR. PONTON: I don't remember the work plan
23 right now. Is there a geophysical component to this to
24 see if we can see these anomalies?

25 MR. NELSON: There isn't because there is

Page 43

1 can tell by your comments that you may not realize that
2 this issue goes back many years, obviously many years.
3 It was one of the first comments that I made as a RAB
4 member that this site was in a bad state. We had a
5 landfill over the top of a cemetery. And we needed to
6 do something about it. The Army was not about to do
7 anything because they had in fact been the perpetrators
8 of putting all this garbage on top of the cemetery. The
9 Trust has gone to these extra measures to begin trying
10 to identify the spacial distribution of the fill, and I
11 hope we can continue to bring in all the data before we
12 make any decisions.

13 Because as Jim said, there is a lot here. There is
14 a lot of issues. It's a national park. And leaving a
15 cemetery of any kind buried by queen-sized hunks of
16 concrete goes in the face of what we ought to be doing.
17 At least that's my opinion. I hope we can continue to
18 hear all the data and continue to have a lot of
19 discussion about this, because it's really an important
20 site.

21 MR. NELSON: Two other things I can say about
22 the site. This is not the first time that human remains
23 have been discovered. They actually have done a
24 discovery during another environmental investigation and
25 then they also had an intentional archeological

Page 42

1 presumably no metal.

2 MR. PONTON: But you would still see density
3 contrasts?

4 MR. BOGGS: But it's beneath landfill
5 material?

6 MR. NELSON: You'd have interpretation
7 problems.

8 MR. PONTON: You never know until you try.

9 MR. NELSON: What we did find overlying the
10 cemetery was significant quantities of soil, huge chunks
11 of concrete as big as a queen-sized mattress. Stuff
12 that couldn't be removed -- asphalt, brick, mortar,
13 chunks of building material, and the like.

14 MR. PONTON: My opinion would be the chances
15 of those big pieces being uniformly spread out may not
16 be as likely as having coffins -- where you'd see some
17 type of pattern density contrast between the fill
18 materials and what was placed there. I've always
19 thought that that site was kind of a very sad site at
20 the Presidio.

21 MR. NELSON: I think there's a fine link
22 between evaluating the layout of the cemetery and the
23 location of the grave versus what are we going to do
24 about the actual fill either way?

25 MR. KERN: For those of you that are new, I

Page 44

1 excavation where they tried to determine what state
2 these coffins were in and things like that.

3 There was one human bone disarticulated -- I think
4 it was a femur -- that was found within the confines of
5 the landfill but not mixed with any other human waste.
6 No other human remains. So that was kind of curious.
7 That was part of the environmental investigation. And
8 then later the same coroner that I dealt with, Charles
9 Cecil, was out there with (INAUDIBLE) and the Army Corp
10 of Engineers and our current archeologist Andy Osborne
11 doing intentional excavation to determine how deep the
12 cemetery was, and in what condition it was in.

13 The second thing I want to share with everybody,
14 which I found fascinating, was that we don't have the
15 only buried cemetery in San Francisco. There are
16 numerous buried cemeteries. Lincoln Park, there were
17 thousands of bodies buried there. There's now the
18 Legion of Honor and a golf course, etc. There were a
19 number down by the Yerba Buena cemetery which is some of
20 the original area of San Francisco settled by the 49ers
21 etc., downtown by the new library, and several others
22 that Mr. Cecil mentioned to me.

23 So it seems to be the Army, however egregious their
24 actions, were fairly consistent with other agencies or
25 organizations in the city in terms of burying

Page 45

1 cemeteries.

2 In looking at this situation, I've come across some
3 information about cemeteries in San Francisco and why
4 there aren't any basically above ground. They were not
5 allowed after a certain period of time. Land was
6 considered too valuable, and so south of San Francisco
7 you have quite a few cemeteries. You won't find too
8 many in the city itself unless you start digging, I
9 guess.

10 Any more questions on that Halloween finding? So we
11 still have some work to do on Landfill 10. It's going
12 to resume next week and should finish up as well. We
13 have some parking lot borings within the western site of
14 the main parking lot there. We're going to install a
15 monitoring well in one of those borings.

16 We're also going to be conducting a landfill toe
17 investigation which will basically be to see how far out
18 does the actual toe or edge of the landfill extend into
19 that Lomas Creek Valley and how deep is the fill as you
20 get to the edge? There's also going to be some sampling
21 of seeps that emanate just downstream of the landfill in
22 the Lobes Creek area, analyzing for potential landfill
23 contaminants as well as other things.

24 Once we get all the results in, we'll probably have
25 a meeting before we put it all into a report. We'll

Page 47

1 typical things you would see in a landfill. Over time
2 they've shown to be -- the water quality is not highly
3 degraded. When the ROD was written for the Public
4 Health Service Hospital in 1985, the Army and the state
5 agency felt that enough groundwater monitoring had
6 occurred that there was no concern. We're going to
7 continue to look at what monitoring has been done since
8 then in cooperation with the new well and the
9 groundwater and the seep data, and do some sort of
10 correlation, if we can, to see if there is similar
11 contaminants, something that's higher in one and not the
12 other. That's all part of the exercise we're
13 undertaking now.

14 MR. BERMAN: So there are no indications right
15 now that there's any seepages or problems with movement
16 from the Landfill 10?

17 MR. NELSON: The landfill material at Landfill
18 10 is a lot of construction debris. Exactly what's been
19 basically said in the past -- huge pieces of concrete,
20 brick and mortar, other pieces of building material like
21 wood. There was a layer of churchale (PHONETIC) rock
22 that was put down on road base before they paved the
23 site. And then there's the tremendous amount of soil as
24 well. That site is upwards of 210,000 yards of
25 material. So it's quite a bit of soil in there. But

Page 46

1 talk about what we found and where we're leaning in
2 terms of how we're interpreting this, this Five Year
3 Review of the remedies. Stay tuned for that. And
4 possibly at the December RAB meeting, I will tell you
5 about the conclusion of Landfill E and these two field
6 investigation sites.

7 MR. BERMAN: Didn't the Army do some sampling
8 downhill from Landfill 10 at one time?

9 MR. NELSON: They put in two monitoring wells.
10 They have taken soil samples. We continue to monitor
11 those groundwater wells.

12 MR. BERMAN: Was there any sign of seepage?

13 MR. NELSON: Well, the seeps don't necessarily
14 emanate from the landfill per se, but they are proximal
15 to the edge of the landfill if you were to look at the
16 boundary map. But they're pretty close to the banks of
17 the creek. And that's pretty much where the creek
18 originates, in that general area. I think it's around
19 17th.

20 MR. BERMAN: So those wells have been
21 monitored?

22 MR. NELSON: Right.

23 MR. BERMAN: What's known about what was
24 found?

25 MR. NELSON: They haven't been showing the

Page 48

1 there wasn't anything indicating some kind of liquid
2 waste or any sort of chemicals or drums or anything like
3 that. Any more questions on that?

4 Landfill E is part of a Feasibility Study which is a
5 study of 35-plus sites where we're evaluating the
6 remedial alternatives. This is a document we've been
7 working on for quite awhile. We're closing in on a date
8 where we're hoping we can release it to the public, the
9 agencies and the RAB for review.

10 Our consultant Erler & Kalinowski is currently
11 revising the Draft Feasibility Study. We had this
12 Cleanup Level Document finalized that we released a few
13 weeks back, and the Feasibility Study has to rely on
14 that document to determine the Contaminants of Concern
15 at the sites. So we couldn't really finish the
16 Feasibility Study until that document was done. That
17 recently went out. We're hoping to get the Feasibility
18 Study document to the agencies and the RAB by -- I want
19 to say, January, February of next year, if all goes as
20 planned. That's all I have to say about that.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is this the final review for
22 the Trust and NPS, or a preliminary review?

23 MR. NELSON: This would be the third time
24 we've seen it. But there's been several changes with
25 the approach and some iterations that have gone on.

1 We've done several additional investigations. We're
2 able to incorporate the November 2001 data and all the
3 past investigations, Fill Site 6 and Battery Howe Wagner
4 and then the Summer 2000 investigation that encompassed
5 quite a few sites.

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: It would go back to EK1 for
7 revision?

8 MR. NELSON: Probably minimal, I would think
9 at this point, because we've seen it so many times.

10 MR. KERN: Anything else for Chris? We might
11 take a ten-minute break.

12 I've been informed that we have a recycling bag. We
13 should be recycling our glass and plastic bottles
14 instead of throwing them away. Let's return in about
15 ten minutes.

16 (Recess taken.)

17 MR. KERN: We are now on to Item 5C. Other
18 project status updates. Craig and Chris.

19 MR. COOPER: We're now on the slide that says
20 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. Our two sites that are
21 under our first CERCLA RAP, let's call it. We got all
22 of the documents and the implementation plan and
23 everything was looking great, as you know. George Ford
24 talked about this. And we were about ready to award to
25 our preferred contractor, and another bidder has now

1 weeks.

2 MR. SUTTER: I know you can't get into the
3 details, but can you give us a sense of the nature of
4 the protest and what areas?

5 MR. COOPER: I was told that I really can't.
6 When it's settled, I think we can.

7 MS. TRIGIANI: He indicated that in his E-mail
8 to me. I sent him an E-mail.

9 MR. BERMAN: But you can comment on whether
10 you think it's substantial. It is a crack complaint or
11 is there substance to it?

12 MR. COOPER: I'd rather not comment. It's not
13 worth it for something to go on the record about me
14 saying something prematurely about somebody's bid
15 protest.

16 MR. BERMAN: Has it been prepared by a legal
17 counsel?

18 MR. COOPER: Yes. It's not somebody getting
19 in front of their laptop and cranking out a letter.
20 It's a very thoughtful bid protest that was prepared by
21 this party's legal counsel.

22 MS. YAROS: It's not very likely that it could
23 be done in two weeks.

24 MR. COOPER: My understanding is one of the
25 possible outcomes is that we could decide that the

1 filed an official protest. We shipped this over to the
2 Trust's legal counsel, and there are certain protocols
3 that need to be followed to analyze a protest. So that
4 attorney and George and Albert Chan, our contracting
5 officer, are meeting very frequently. This is our first
6 big protest on something of such a large, multi-million
7 dollar project. We're being very careful here.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is there one protest or two
9 protests?

10 MR. COOPER: One protest. It's a very long
11 letter. Unfortunately, I'd love to tell you the
12 details, but I really can't because of the sensitive
13 nature of a legal protest. We've been advised by our
14 legal counsel. Let me just say that I hope we resolve
15 it shortly, and I'm praying that it will be resolved in
16 a manner so we can start construction this year.

17 As you know, we've had everything all lined up.
18 Terri Thomas just sent me an E-mail today saying, "Are
19 you going to start or not?" If you don't start by X
20 date, then all these plants I have ready to roll here
21 are going to have to go someplace else." And then if
22 you start maybe later on, then you have to set up
23 irrigation lines which increases the cost of
24 construction, and things really start to complicate if
25 we don't start construction within about two or three

1 protest is without merit. And we could set it aside and
2 award a contract.

3 MS. YAROS: That would be the only way we
4 could settle it within two weeks.

5 MR. COOPER: Yes. If we decide it does have
6 merit, the project won't happen. As they say, if it
7 isn't one thing, it's another. Keep your fingers
8 crossed on that one.

9 Petroleum problem. I was just talking to Jim about
10 that. There was a meeting held by the Trust and the
11 Regional Water Quality Control Board on October 5th
12 about one order the Regional Board has in place at the
13 Presidio. It's called Order 91-082. It's an order with
14 respect to Buildings 231 and 937. They're very old
15 orders, in some respects. It was actually an order that
16 was sent to the Army, from the Regional Board to the
17 Army, which says you need to do this, that, and the
18 other thing at these two petroleum release sites.

19 Now we at the Presidio Trust, we want to sit down
20 with the Regional Board and say, "How do we get back
21 into compliance with this order? It's been kind of set
22 adrift a little bit." We're doing work on these two
23 buildings and we're moving forward in a way that I think
24 the Regional Board is satisfied. But the order says
25 we've taken a different course in some respects in what

1 the order says specifically. So we've come up at least
2 with an interim strategy at this point in time on how to
3 make linkages between what the order says and what the
4 Trust is doing, just so no one can accuse us for
5 blatantly disregarding a Regional Board Order and
6 calling it blatant and intentional non-compliance. We
7 certainly don't want to do that. That's what we're
8 going to do in the interim.

9 Next slide. There are other things that we're going
10 to do to try to upgrade our compliance efforts with this
11 order. For example, there is reports that the Army and
12 now the Presidio Trust -- we've inherited the liability
13 under these orders from the Army. We were going to send
14 quarterly reports to highlight petroleum cleanup
15 progress so Jim can better track our progress in the
16 Petroleum Program. I don't know if Jim would like to
17 add anything on the meeting in the course of those at
18 this point? No? Okay. All right. That's the
19 Petroleum Program.

20 Other things going on. I'm just going to highlight
21 them real fast. It's all basically documentation. We
22 talked about Crissy Field closure. It's now just a
23 matter of getting all the records and the documents and
24 the explanations in place to explain why we believe that
25 our cleanups at the Skeet Range, at Fill Site 7, at

1 sure that we're following the rules and regulations and
2 that we haven't missed anything and that we haven't left
3 anything behind that could threaten public health and
4 the environment.

5 Our on our Lead-Based Paint in Soils program, we're
6 working on this big document for DTSC that basically
7 talks about our entire program, the entire universe of
8 Presidio building; what's their status; which ones have
9 been characterized for lead contamination around them;
10 which ones haven't been characterized yet; which ones
11 have been cleaned up; what's our cleanup levels and
12 what's our cleanup strategy; the whole procedures are
13 outlined in this document. I predict it's going to be
14 released by the end of the month to the regulators.
15 There's a couple of bullets there giving you general
16 statistics about how much progress we've made in our
17 Lead-Based Paint Controls Program so far.

18 Obviously we have a lot of work to go. If you check
19 out our construction schedule for the Remediation
20 Program that we handed out at the last RAB meeting, in
21 2003, 4, 5 and 6, we want to do 50 lead-based paint in
22 soil cleanups a year. One a week.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Is this both residential and
24 non-residential buildings?

25 MR. COOPER: Both. Our universe is all

1 Building 900 area, are indeed construction complete.
2 We're going to request at least partial site
3 certification. There's a little bit of groundwater
4 monitoring we still have to do down in the Building 900
5 area. That has been a very difficult process, kind of
6 pulling together all the work that the Army has done and
7 understanding the RAPS that the Army wrote for Crissy
8 Field. So we have contractors pulling all of that
9 together.

10 The same thing is true for DEH Operable Unit request
11 for site certification. We've sent the regulators our
12 request for site certification. Again, site
13 certification means that we believe that we've met all
14 of our cleanup levels and all the monitoring is
15 finished, and basically there is No Further Response
16 Action necessary for that area. And the regulators will
17 write back and say, "We agree and certify that as closed
18 out." So it's big step to get that. The regulators
19 sent us some draft comments on our Site Certification
20 Area for DEH, which is a little section sitting down on
21 Crissy Field. We're going to sit down with them and try
22 to work out some final issues regarding that particular
23 piece too.

24 Probably not too interesting to you. A lot of paper
25 documentation to try to get everything in place to make

1 buildings in the Presidio.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Are they combined in the same
3 program now? If you do 50 a year, would there be some
4 of each category?

5 MR. COOPER: Yes. Right. How to prioritize
6 them is there are certain buildings that we definitely
7 want to do before others, at least on higher probability
8 of exposure. Then the real estate department also tells
9 the Remediation Department where they think new tenants
10 are going to be moving in and so on. Nina Larson, who
11 is our Lead-based project manager, she keeps a priority
12 list of which ones are highest priority to us. When
13 that document gets released, we can definitely have a
14 more thorough discussion of our Lead-based Paint Program
15 which I don't know if we've had much discussion in
16 detail in the past.

17 Just to finish up, we had sent a document to DTSC
18 regarding the Letterman Army Institute that George Ford
19 has been working on that for months, the whole Letterman
20 (INAUDIBLE). We ran into a little bit of contamination
21 here and there which we cleaned up, and we summed all
22 that work up into a document to DTSC, and on
23 November 4th DTSC wrote back and said they were
24 satisfied with all the cleanups that we've done, and
25 based on the data to date there's No Further Action in

1 that area at this point in time. The standard caveat,
2 if contamination is found in the future, we'll notify
3 them and coordinate them again. But there isn't
4 anything on our radar screen at all now in the
5 Letterman/LAIR area in soil contamination.

6 The last thing I want to talk about is just -- we've
7 got the RAP for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. Hopefully
8 we'll be able to start construction this year. But as
9 you know from our construction schedule, we basically
10 need to get a RAP out every year. Our next one is for
11 Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6.
12 The next RAP -- I'm working on that. I'm the project
13 manager on that. I hope to get the next RAP to the Park
14 Service by late next week, and hopefully it'll be in
15 good enough shape with some minor editing from the Park
16 Service to get it to the regulators in December. The
17 design work on that is already proceeding.

18 And to stay ahead of the curve, we've already
19 started to work on the next RAP that is going to be
20 after that one. That's for Baker Beach Disturbed Areas
21 1 and 2. There's some other sites on that too. But
22 Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1 and 2 are going to be the
23 most important sites in the next RAP, and we've sent out
24 a Task Order to the contractor for that. We're going to
25 bring our contractor to the site to start scoping out

1 the RAP for that one. We're kind of lining these RAPS
2 up now, deciding how to group sites together in RAPS so
3 we can get a RAP with an adequate amount of sites turned
4 out every year so we can do construction every year for
5 that RAP. And that's it. Thank you for your attention.

6 MR. BERMAN: In the thinking about the RAP for
7 the Baker Beach area, there are some that have some very
8 steep slopes. What's the plan of attack to remove --
9 some of the debris is actually physically obvious to the
10 casual observation, but it's very steep there. I was
11 wondering what the mechanics of that is.

12 MR. COOPER: Stay tuned for the details, is
13 all I can say. That's why we wanted to get a
14 contractor in place because we knew the landfills are on
15 slopes. Once the contractors have done a site walk and
16 start to put some thought on the most cost-effective way
17 to remove that contamination, we'll share that
18 information to you well in advance of writing the RAP.
19 You guys will be the first ones to get a recommendation
20 (INAUDIBLE) I don't know which one is going to be
21 recommended by the Trust at this point.

22 MR. SUTTER: One last question about the bid
23 protest. Is the protest with the second low bidder?

24 MR. COOPER: I don't think I can say that.
25 It's obviously another bidder. It's not some external

1 third party. I think I can say that.

2 MR. SUTTER: You can't say in which order?
3 You can't identify them, the protester?

4 MR. COOPER: No, I would rather not.

5 MR. SUTTER: My concern is that, as I recall,
6 the low bid and the second low bid were rather close
7 together, and then there was quite a spread to the next
8 bid. I think you see where I'm heading on this. I
9 respect the confidentiality.

10 MR. COOPER: Yeah. It's a tricky one.

11 MR. BERMAN: A minor question. You mentioned
12 an annual petroleum site report. Does that mean there
13 will be one coming out at the end of this calendar year?

14 MR. COOPER: George has prepared a
15 long-awaited Petroleum Program Plan. He sent it to the
16 Park Service. I would expect one would be released by
17 the end of this year. George is finished working on it.
18 December, hopefully. I'm pretty sure that's been sent
19 over to Brian. I'm 99 percent sure Brian will have some
20 comments.

21 MR. KERN: Updates or ideas, suggestions
22 comments from Jim and Bob?

23 MR. BOGGS: The only thing I might add as part
24 of the Lead-based Paint Program Craig talked about is I
25 went around with Nina Larson today and actually did a

1 little audit of several of the buildings around the
2 Presidio; a couple of the buildings where remediation
3 has been done, and lead abatement has been done in a
4 couple of buildings where they determined No Further
5 Action.

6 What we found out is of all the soil samples I
7 tested around the building, everything came up below
8 their cleanup levels. So that was a good thing. A lot
9 of the buildings still have very, very high levels of
10 lead-based paint on them. At one of the residences, for
11 example, kids could chew on the steps and not have a
12 problem, but if they chewed on the columns, they'd be
13 getting too much lead. How we're going to keep kids
14 just eating the steps, I don't know. But at least they
15 can eat the dirt around the building. It will probably
16 be in the Spring when the Plan gets worked out and the
17 details -- we'll be doing a more extensive kind of audit
18 of what's been done and what needs to take place.

19 MR. PONTON: I have nothing to add.

20 MR. KERN: Did people get Jim's comment
21 letters.

22 MR. BERMAN: They were very good and extremely
23 detailed, aside from catching typos. I really
24 appreciated the extensive work you're doing there. It
25 really got into fine-print detail on a lot of issues.

Page 61

1 To me, they were impressive.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: At what point does it become
3 necessary to make immediate action to present? Like
4 what's the best practice associated with preventing
5 homes that have children in them?

6 MR. BOGGS: Generally, what has been worked
7 up, for the paint that's on the building, that's called
8 (INAUDIBLE). That's a separate body of guidelines and
9 regulations to follow for paint on the structure. My
10 agency comes in when that paint falls off of the house
11 and comes into the soil. It's called a release into the
12 environment. We've come up with a cleanup level for
13 lead for residences here at the Presidio. It's 373.

14 That's on an average. What's been agreed to is --

15 MS. TRIGIANI: You're saying this is all
16 outside the structure?

17 MR. BOGGS: This is the dirt that the kids
18 will eat at a (INAUDIBLE) because you figure at home,
19 kids play in the backyard and eat dirt. They have a
20 ceiling level of 400 parts per million.

21 MR. BERMAN: That's not an average.

22 MR. BOGGS: It's a ceiling. If they get a
23 sample above 400, they dig it up. It's my understanding
24 that they do this work before they have people move in.
25 They're trying to get this done before people live

Page 63

1 MS. CHEEVER: A related question I remember
2 discussing a few years ago is paint that's on the
3 building a part of what your mandate is (INAUDIBLE) the
4 hundred million dollars.

5 MR. COOPER: First we have to take care of all
6 the releases to the environment, and hose all that out.
7 That's all the paint that goes into the soil, all the
8 CERCLA sites and petroleum sites. My understanding has
9 been if we have money left over, that money can go
10 toward other environmental work such as lead abatement
11 and asbestos abatement work. But that is way down the
12 road. It isn't an allowable expenditure for the hundred
13 million. We have to finish the remediation work first.

14 MS. CHEEVER: So for example, in the abatement
15 you described now, in taking off obvious chips and
16 testing it, is that coming out of the hundred million?

17 MR. COOPER: No. Separate budget. Nina's
18 work is only digging up contaminated soil around the
19 buildings.

20 MR. HERMANN: Do we know what the
21 deterioration rate is? I mean, we're going to clean up
22 all the soils? Is it all going to be back here in the
23 soil in five years?

24 MR. COOPER: That's the question that remains.

25 MR. HERMANN: Then why do it? Why not burn

Page 62

1 there.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: So on the inside then,
3 everything has been cleaned up before a tenant is moved
4 in?

5 MR. COOPER: The abatement is done before
6 tenants move in, but the question Bob brought up is
7 that's the initial abatement. Now there's lead-based
8 paint, and you don't remove necessarily 100 percent of
9 it. You remove the obvious chipping and you put the
10 sealant down. It's our responsibility to make sure that
11 we have some type of routine maintenance program to
12 inspect the interior walls and exterior walls of these
13 buildings. What we abated 3, 4, or 5 years ago, the
14 effectiveness is going to wear off and the paint can
15 start chipping again.

16 That's an interesting question. I need to talk to
17 Mark in our lead abatement program.

18 MS. TRIGIANI: I'd be curious as to the answer
19 because I know in my unit there is so many layers of
20 paint, that if you just run into a wall a certain way it
21 comes off. I can only imagine people that have children
22 in some of these units what might be flying off. That
23 is a question I've heard, which is why I'm raising it to
24 you. If we could somehow get that answered in
25 committee, that would be really helpful.

Page 64

1 the buildings down or do something else? It doesn't
2 really make a lot of sense.

3 MR. COOPER: I think if you maintain your
4 abatement program so that it doesn't get re-contaminated
5 --

6 MR. BERMAN: I think it's known that you put a
7 sealant on it on a regular basis -- I don't know if it's
8 every three or four years -- something if you continue
9 to do, then it's okay. An occasional chip, maybe that
10 would happen, but then you still would not get up to the
11 level above the risk.

12 MR. HERMANN: You won't have to dig it up
13 again.

14 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Right. I think it's
15 really important that the leasing arrangement or
16 whatever contain clauses where lead has been found in
17 the paints, that a maintenance program that assures that
18 continuous maintenance occurs in those buildings -- it
19 seems to me that's an important part of the
20 responsibility.

21 MR. DISTEFANO: Something else I'd like to
22 point out is over time, the amount of lead in the paint
23 decreased. Something that the Park Service has found
24 out over on the other side of the bridge is that there's
25 actually a pretty good cutoff date in 1950 where

Page 65

1 buildings before that era had a lot more paint in the
2 soils surrounding the buildings than the sites built
3 after that date. You can start to use even construction
4 dates, construction building types, and start to use
5 that as criteria for your priorities on where you abate.

6 MR. KERN: Any other questions for Jim and
7 Bob?

8 Item 7. Some 40 documents that have come out.
9 Thanks for including those on the agenda. A couple of
10 work plans, cleanup level documents, and certification
11 report. Those are available for your review.

12 MR. BERMAN: Are any of those available
13 electronically?

14 MR. NELSON: You mean on our website or on a
15 CD or something? I don't believe so, no. We came up
16 against the whole ADA issue. That's the main reason why
17 we haven't been able to do it.

18 MR. BERMAN: It seems kind of a shame. It
19 makes life so much easier when you don't have to
20 transport yourself to the library, and you can scan it
21 on the computer. If there is something you want to
22 worry about, you can copy that page and bring your
23 thoughts with you here to the meeting.

24 MR. NELSON: We need to look into whether or
25 not we're violating ADA by providing CD copies -- I

Page 67

1 you're concerned about, you can find something that
2 you're concerned about. You don't have to read the
3 whole report. It's much easier to do that when you're
4 volunteering your time, then have to spend the time to
5 go down to Building 34 and then get the document. If
6 you want something to take home and read again, you've
7 got to copy it. You have to make arrangements for
8 copying. It's really a nuisance, in a sense. I think
9 since you're getting volunteer time from the community
10 members of RAB, you should look to ways to allow them to
11 facilitate getting at the document in a way which
12 doesn't require so much effort.

13 MR. NELSON: What if we had additional copies
14 in the 1750 Library? Say we had three or four extra
15 copies of each document, and people if they wanted could
16 come to that library and take them, as long as they
17 brought them back.

18 MR. COOPER: Or we can mail you a copy. You
19 won't even have to go anywhere.

20 MR. BERMAN: That's the worst, because then
21 you've got 40 pounds of paper to deal with on a regular
22 basis.

23 MR. BOGGS: You might consider -- it's
24 actually another chunk of work -- I've seen them where
25 they've actually got them hyperlinked and actually --

Page 66

1 think we probably are. It's not a website thing, but it
2 discriminates against people who can't see. If you give
3 them a CD, they can't do anything with it. So unless
4 there's an audio portion where the text is read to
5 you --

6 MR. COOPER: I've gotten documents E-mailed to
7 me electronically, the ones that we've been
8 distributing, and it's not as easy as you think it might
9 be. It's all in different files. You have the text
10 files and then all the figures are in separate files.
11 All the tables are in separate files. If you're reading
12 along, it will say, "Table Two says this." Then you've
13 got to go out of that file, click on Table Two, open
14 Table Two, look at Table Two, and then go back to your
15 text file. It's pretty tricky to read a document that
16 is --

17 MR. BERMAN: You can split the screen.

18 MR. COOPER: You can. What I've found, I've
19 been asked to read so much on the computer, it's not
20 good for your eyes.

21 MR. BERMAN: The advantage that I'm talking
22 about is that you can scan. You don't have to read the
23 report. You have to read the report word for word, and
24 it's your responsibility. But for a RAB member, they
25 can go through it, and if there's certain issues that

Page 68

1 where it says figure one in the text, you click on it
2 and it pulls up the figure for you. It's a lot of work
3 and expense to do that. There might be certain levels
4 of reports that would be worthy of doing that. Not all
5 reports, obviously. I don't know how you'd divvy that
6 up.

7 The loaner reports. They might be a very good idea,
8 but when we have these four reports at the RAB meeting,
9 that's when everybody is going to be here anyway. Just
10 have a few that people could check out that might be
11 interested. And so people that are showing up for the
12 RAB could potentially walk home with a report if they
13 wanted to without having to come down to the Presidio
14 library.

15 MR. BERMAN: If you can do that, why can't you
16 just come with a CD?

17 MR. BOGGS: Probably can, but there's quite an
18 additional expense to put it on in that way.

19 MR. BERMAN: But these reports are written on
20 a computer most of the time anyway. You can just make a
21 CD directly.

22 MR. COOPER: Not with these hyperlinks, but
23 with the figures and tables in all the different files,
24 that isn't so hard.

25 MR. BERMAN: If you can come with a report,

Page 69

1 you can come with a CD, and you don't have to worry
2 about returning it and it's not 40 pounds of extra
3 weight.

4 MR. NELSON: I guess we can look into that and
5 see what the possibility is.

6 MR. PONTON: The groundwater reports are on
7 CD.

8 MR. NELSON: It's got something to do with
9 electronic deliverables. The ADA protects all people.
10 It has to do with electronic deliverables. If you hand
11 somebody a CD, that's considered an electronic
12 deliverable and it should be accessible to anybody, the
13 same as if it were available on the web.

14 MR. BOGGS: Handing somebody a report would
15 then essentially be the identical thing. If they can't
16 read, they're not going to be digest it.

17 MR. NELSON: But that's not electronic. It's
18 a hard copy. So someone can read it to them. I don't
19 know. I haven't studied the law. That was just the
20 issue that was coming up. We had this guy who worked
21 for the Trust and it basically ground to a halt our
22 efforts to put our library online. We were going to
23 have to jump through so many hoops to comply with the
24 ADA. Maybe we can give you an update at the next RAB
25 meeting and find out where it stands, what steps have

Page 71

1 MR. BERMAN: One action item was Dennis
2 brought up some questions on financial accounting. It
3 may be pertinent or not.

4 MR. KERN: I think the financial accounting
5 we've been tending to work with in the committee
6 meetings. Hopefully they'll be something to discuss at
7 the next committee meeting.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Also the membership
9 applications were going to be delivered to the committee
10 members.

11 MR. COOPER: To Jan. Right. Anna was going
12 to check with Denise and make sure that the applications
13 are (INAUDIBLE) And I have it as an action item to
14 check on our truck lead abatement program on what type
15 of program we're doing for sites that have been abated
16 to make sure that these lead-based paint chips don't
17 return. I'll report back on that.

18 MR. KERN: Agenda items, as always, to Mark
19 for both meetings coming up. Are there any other
20 comments, questions this evening? Seeing none, thank
21 you.

22 Are we scheduled over Thanksgiving for our committee
23 meeting?

24 MR. NELSON: No, it's the Tuesday before.

25 MR. KERN: So I hope to see some of you then.

Page 70

1 been taken. I know the Trust has other documents like
2 the PTIM was on the web. You could click throughout the
3 document. How does that comply versus our documents and
4 what is the expense? We can look into that. I feel
5 your pain. Trust me.

6 MR. COOPER: In the interim, I don't want you
7 to feel excluded in the process.

8 MR. BERMAN: It's not that. I'm limited in
9 space for paper. I'd just rather not have the report.

10 MR. COOPER: Then you would mail it back to
11 us.

12 MR. BERMAN: But still, it's much more
13 convenient. If you could give me the report and you
14 can't give me a CD, to me I can't follow the logic to
15 that. The damage to my brain that occurred from walking
16 the dog through that area --

17 MR. KERN: A lot of collateral damage.

18 All right. I think the point has been made. I
19 think you've been given some assurance that it will be
20 looked into, perhaps even on a one-on-one basis.

21 Let's look at action items. I know next week we
22 have some trenching at Landfill E, one of the most
23 exciting things that I can imagine happening, next
24 Thursday and Friday. I didn't see a lot of other action
25 items.

Page 72

1 If we don't, have a good Thanksgiving holiday, and I
2 look forward to seeing you in December. Meeting
3 adjourned.

4 (The meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.)

5 ---oOo---

RAB MEMBERS

- 1
- 2 Sam Berman
- 3 Jan Blum
- 4 Bob Boggs, DTSC
- 5 Edward Callahan
- 6 Julie Cheever
- 7 Craig Cooper
- 8 Doug Kern
- 9 Joel Hermann
- 10 Julian Hultgren
- 11 Jan Monaghan
- 12 Chris Nelson, Presidio Trust
- 13 Peter O'Hara
- 14 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
- 15 David Sutter
- 16 Mary Trigiani
- 17 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
- 18 Gloria Yaros
- 19 Mark Youngkin
- 20
- 21 Also present:
- 22 Tony DiStefano
- 23 Anna Fenton-Hathaway
- 24
- 25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50
THE PRESIDIO

December 12, 2002
7:00 p.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

COPY

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

MR. COOPER: My name is Craig Cooper. And I work for the Presidio Trust.

MR. FORD: I'm George Ford, manager of remedial construction for the Presidio Trust.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I'm Mark Youngkin. I'm a community member, and I'm actually a community co-chair. I've been a member since 1997.

MR. PONTON: I'm Jim Ponton. I work for the State of California, the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

MR. DOWNING: Dennis Downing. I'm a retaining member for about two years.

MR. HERMANN: Joel Hermann, a community member.

MS. YAROS: Gloria Yaros, a community member for about two years.

MS. MONAGHAN: My name is Jan Monaghan. I'm a community member. I've been on the board since [inaudible].

MR. BERMAN: Sam Berman. I'm a community member. Been here since 1997.

MR. DISTEFANO: Tony Distefano, representing the National Park Service [inaudible].

MR. O'HARA: Peter O'Hara. I'm a community member.

[Proceedings began at 7:01 p.m.]

MR. KERN: I appreciate you folks who have arrived on time. I'd like to welcome everyone tonight to the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, our regular monthly meeting and the last one for 2002. Next year, in April, we'll be heading into our tenth year, the beginning of our tenth year in April.

I'd like to welcome you tonight to the Presidio Trust and their contractors, the National Park Service, our regulatory committee, the community RAB members that are here, and particularly like to welcome many of you that are here tonight as prospective candidates for the Board. Thank you for coming out on a December evening to see how this is all going to unfold tonight.

Does everyone have an agenda? Are there any additions or changes to tonight's agenda?

All right. Seeing none, we'll move on with that agenda, then. Are there any announcements or old business tonight?

Introductions around the room. That's a good idea for folks that are here tonight.

I guess I'll start. My name is Doug Kern, community member of the RAB and have been since the start in April 1994

MR. ANDERSON: Jerry Anderson. I'm a community member.

MR. BOGGS: Bob Boggs, State Department of Toxics.

MR. KERN: Any other introductions that I missed?

MS. HATHAWAY: I'm Anna Hathaway. I work for the Presidio Trust.

MR. KERN: Anybody else? Perhaps we will get to know you folks during the break. I think we have some announcements to make later on.

I notice an announcement here on Item 3, the deadline for the next cleanup committee. Any report on that?

MR. COOPER: I think Anna's got an update on that.

MS. HATHAWAY: I just wanted to let you all know that the deadline for the next "Cleanup News" -- if you want to write an article for that -- is February 5th. The real deadline is February 7th, but we would like two days just to look to make sure.

MR. COOPER: So the next "Cleanup News" is going to be in the March 2003 Presidio Post. And so that's why we come up with the deadline in February for the Trust to take a look at it from the RAB report side.

Page 5

1 And just if you want to give us a heads-up to
2 write articles, that would be great. Come on in. We
3 need help in researching this. We have a library at
4 Building 34, and we have a library in Building 1750.
5 Contact Anna. And I've already sent a message out to
6 the Presidio Trust staff about getting ideas for
7 articles. So I know George will be definitely writing
8 an article.

9 MR. KERN: I guess I should state at the
10 outset that since we've had these meetings now for
11 several years, it's very possible that some of the
12 things we say will seem bizarre or not connected or
13 weird or out of context. It's just that we've gotten
14 used to it. There may be acronyms, so feel free to
15 raise a hand and say, "What does that mean?" It's
16 informal in that sense, and we want you to interact. We
17 want this to be as informal as it can be.

18 Other announcements or old business? Are we
19 going to do some sort of history thing tonight?

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah. We thought that would be
21 nice.

22 MR. COOPER: Right. It's not on the agenda,
23 but I wasn't too sure where to put it, but I think right
24 now would be a good place.

25 MR. KERN: Right now? Okay.

Page 6

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Or we could do it under "New
2 Business" or do it under "Membership." I think Anna was
3 going to talk under membership, too. Why don't you do
4 it under "Membership Committee Report"?

5 MR. KERN: Very good. Any other announcements
6 or old business?

7 Okay. Moving on to committee business.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Fourth Tuesday of every month,
9 we have a Planning Committee meeting. It's a more
10 informal group, and it's like a work group where we go
11 over topics and review reports that have come out and
12 discuss various things. So we encourage everyone to
13 attend those meetings.

14 In December we never have a fourth Tuesday
15 Planning Committee meeting because it's just before
16 Christmas, like two days, so the next one will be in
17 January, the fourth Tuesday.

18 Our last meeting was on November 26th. We met
19 in Building 1750, second-floor conference room. The
20 topics we discussed were Landfill 4, Fill Site 5 removal
21 action; and we had an update from the Trust on the
22 status of that bid package, which has been protested.
23 We'll probably be talking more about that tonight.

24 We also had an update and discussion on the
25 landfill field investigations that are going on right

Page 7

1 now. And there's actually field investigations at
2 Landfill 8, Landfill 10, Landfill E. And we discussed
3 the preliminaries of some of those investigations.

4 We had a discussion of the mustard gas matter.
5 And an update from the Trust on that, I think, so we're
6 talking about that some more tonight. We'll get more of
7 an update on that later on.

8 Then we had a long discussion on financial
9 reporting. The Membership Committee met at the end of
10 the meeting. We went through the procedure for going
11 through the membership applications and how to deal --
12 we had like 65 applications.

13 Then we ended up by talking about the upcoming
14 newsletter, which we just talked a little bit about
15 here; and we try to get together and do an RAB committee
16 article for the Presidio Trust newsletter every quarter.
17 So it's kind of a long process for us as volunteers to
18 get an article together and do that, so we like to get
19 the ball rolling pretty early.

20 Like I said, our next meeting will be in
21 January, fourth Tuesday. Hope everyone can make it
22 then. Thank you.

23 MR. KERN: Any questions?

24 MS. MONAGHAN: The Membership Committee met
25 last Tuesday night and reviewed the 67 applications in

Page 8

1 great detail. We came up with a short list of 13
2 people, some of whom are here tonight. And we were
3 thinking that we would identify the members of the
4 Membership Committee so that you can come up and
5 introduce yourselves at the break and talk to us about
6 any questions you have or make suggestions. We'd like
7 to know who is here and have a chance to meet you.

8 So I'm on the Membership Committee.

9 [The members of the Membership Committee --
10 Mr. Downing, Ms. Cheever, Mr. Yaros, Mr. Kern, and Mr.
11 Youngkin -- introduced themselves.]

12 MR. KERN: Good. So now we are ready for our
13 brief history of RAB involvement in the Presidio, which
14 is almost nine years. Did you want to start, Craig --
15 or you don't want to start.

16 Mark, did you just want me to do my thing?

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Right.

18 MR. KERN: April, 1994. And just prior to
19 that there were ads in the newspaper that I saw, much
20 like ads that you saw, probably, that signaled a start
21 of a Restoration Advisory Board for the Presidio. There
22 had been a technical advisory group meeting prior to
23 that time, and out of that group a RAB was formed. So
24 we had the initial meeting.

25 The lead agency at the time was the Army. And

Page 9

1 I believe there were colonels and different people in
2 uniform there. It was very official, but, much like
3 tonight, we were all in the audience. It seemed that
4 there were some people who knew a whole lot about all
5 the sites and all the issues, and then most of us who
6 knew absolutely nothing about it.

7 There was -- it was dramatic. And right from
8 the start there seemed to be quite a bit of sort of an
9 adversarial nature to it. The Army was, in my
10 opinion -- I have developed an opinion over these
11 years -- that they wanted to leave the site with as
12 little involvement as possible and just walk away, as
13 has been the case for much of the military at many of
14 the sites across the country.

15 Well, that's how many of us began to learn a
16 little bit about what was going on. It seemed not the
17 most efficient use of all these people's time, sitting
18 around, so I just said I have some facilitation
19 experience. I volunteered to do a few meetings. And
20 then they decided that we may as well interview a whole
21 bunch of facilitators. We went through a lot of
22 process, and eventually they stuck with me. And so
23 we've been doing it ever since. And we cut the meetings
24 down to one regular RAB meeting and one committee
25 meeting. That's just sort of to give you a flavor of

Page 10

1 how things started.

2 In the early part of the RAB we were still in
3 what's called the "remedial investigation phase." The
4 Army was still out actively sampling and collecting
5 samples, seeing what was contaminated and what was not
6 and providing that data to us in a way that tried to
7 minimize what seemed to be a problem.

8 Hopefully, I'm not coloring this too much.
9 The Army is no longer here, so they can't really defend
10 themselves. Maybe in the next RAB meeting -- that's
11 true, they will be here, so you can ask. There will be
12 a guy here at our next RAB meeting who was along for
13 that entire time from the very beginning, so you can ask
14 him if any of this is bogus or not.

15 So we had many discussions about data, and
16 eventually by 1997 the Army produced what was called a
17 "feasibility study," which was their attempt at
18 categorizing all of the known sites -- somewhere between
19 30 and 50 sites across the Presidio and almost 17 or 18
20 landfills, which is usually very surprising to most
21 people that there are that many landfills here at the
22 Presidio. Their decision for the base was to do \$36
23 million worth of cleanup. Less than \$2 million of that
24 was actually moving contaminated dirt away from the
25 site. Most of the rest of the money was to monitor that

Page 11

1 waste and contain it in place through capping landfills
2 and other kinds of mechanisms.

3 The RAB rallied community support, saying this
4 is not acceptable and, through a process of probably
5 over a year's worth of interaction with the Army,
6 rejected their proposal flat out. There were some 60
7 comments suggesting that the document was flawed, and
8 there were one or two that were actually in favor of the
9 Army's proposal.

10 In 1996, the Presidio Trust was formed, and
11 they had little staff at that time. The Park Service
12 was more involved in the area, I guess you would say,
13 but over time the Presidio Trust, which I think maybe at
14 some point a Trust staff person would be better to give
15 the whole history of all that and how they've been
16 involved. There's been quite an evolution since 1996.
17 Staff came on. Consultants came on.

18 One of the first initial projects was the
19 remediation program. What to do with this big document
20 that the Army provided that really wasn't going to clean
21 things up? Through that process, there began to be
22 negotiations between the Trust and the Army for the
23 Presidio Trust to take over lead agency status of the
24 cleanup; and over probably another year of effort
25 between 1998-1999 there were negotiations. Eventually

Page 12

1 the Army agreed to pay \$100 million to take over the
2 clean up of the Presidio. The Army still retains
3 responsibility for certain as-yet-unresolved materials,
4 unexploded ordnance, chemical and biological warfare
5 [inaudible], if they're ever discovered. And all the
6 the rest of the known contamination is the
7 responsibility of Craig and his department for \$100
8 million.

9 Our role continues to be to work with the
10 Trust and to see that the money is spent as well as it
11 can be for remedies that the community in agreement with
12 the regulatory community and the Park Service and the
13 Trust, all work to everyone's benefit.

14 So we've been working with the Trust now for
15 some three years, and in that period a lot of work that
16 was not done by the Army in those first six years that
17 we were here has had to be done. So here we are now in
18 2003, and we are on the verge of actually starting to
19 clean up some of the big-ticket items. It's one of the
20 first things that you'll be hearing about that has taken
21 quite some time and effort to approach.

22 It's really unusual but I think you'll find a
23 very appropriate remedy in the National Park that we
24 have to get rid of this contamination and not contain it
25 in place. So a lot of work that we've been doing over

Page 13

1 the years has been to have this place cleaned up so no
2 one will have to worry about that down the road.

3 Now, that is a really condensed version.
4 Would anybody like to add to that?

5 MR. BERMAN: Well, I would like you to add a
6 little bit about the legislation that took place which
7 is behind the RAB so that people will understand that
8 it's not just a community endeavor by bootstrap.

9 MR. KERN: Each one of the closed military
10 bases around the country -- and there have been over
11 300 -- where RABs have been formed is due to
12 presidential order. And so if a base wants to -- I
13 think there's a certain number of people that they group
14 together to form a RAB -- and there would be funding
15 provided for assembly rooms and facilitation and things
16 of that kind and funds provided to copy documents and
17 provide them to members of the public that want them.
18 So that's the essence of how this group was formed.

19 When the Army left, in 1999, the Presidio
20 Trust retained the RAB as a community on-site group as a
21 restoration advisory board that has a charter and
22 by-laws, which we are actually quite proud of. We have
23 spent a lot of time working those over and revising
24 them. And many RABs around the country actually
25 requested our by-laws to help them along as they formed

Page 14

1 their by-laws. So that's how we have a sort of basis
2 for existence, that we're not just a bunch of community
3 people getting together.

4 Any other things people think are important to
5 throw in at this point? Questions from anyone in the
6 audience?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any concern of
8 this restoration advisory board really dealing with
9 toxic or hazardous materials that may be found in the
10 Presidio and not restoring the site to its original
11 flora and fauna and those types of decisions?

12 MR. KERN: It's a really good question. We
13 have a relatively limited focus. And that is
14 principally what is contamination, and how is it going
15 to being dealt with. That's what we've retained as our
16 focus through the whole time period. There are aspects
17 of restoration or what will be the future site's reuse
18 at a contaminated site, but we don't get involved in
19 helping to guide what the reuse will be. We incorporate
20 reuse in our decision-making process.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who is going to be
22 joining us at the next meeting that has an Army history?

23 MR. KERN: The Army person is Bruce Hanover,
24 who was on the Board since the beginning. He's going to
25 be coming to talk to us about the mustard gas issue.

Page 15

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When will the work of
2 this Board be deemed complete?

3 MR. KERN: Well, there are schedules out there
4 that would suggest that the actual cleanup work would
5 hopefully be done in seven to ten years, maybe. And we
6 are quite hopeful it could be done in our life times.
7 That's the hope.

8 Would it be done after, say, all the cleanup
9 was done? If there was a lot of monitoring associated
10 with the remedies that were selected, I hope that there
11 would be a group around to oversee what the monitoring
12 results would be coming out. We are not really trying
13 to complete a lot of monitoring.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To follow up on the
15 first question, is there other coordination then with
16 the board and with the people who make those decisions
17 on the other types of restoration that will take place?

18 MR. KERN: Very much so. Tony and Brian with
19 the Park Service are the principal people involved with
20 that liaison activity, where they're more the
21 remediation folks, but they interact with the Park
22 Service people and natural resources staff with the
23 Trust. So does Craig that will coordinate what kind of
24 restoration would be going on at a site.

25 MR. COOPER: We talk about restoration quite a

Page 16

1 bit at meetings. Also, you'll find out about the
2 remediation programs because it is fully funded. It's
3 going to play a really important and integral role in
4 transforming the park and restoring a lot of the park in
5 accordance with the Trust and the Park Service's vision
6 for how we want future use and future vegetation to be
7 planted in the park.

8 We hired a new person at the Presidio Trust
9 recently. His name is Mark Frye. We are going to bring
10 him to the January RAB meeting. And he is going to be
11 the person involved in setting up the revegetation plans
12 for the remediation sites in Area B of the Presidio, so
13 I'll be bringing him to the January RAB meeting. Again,
14 as Doug said, it's not a primary focus but an important
15 part of what we do because that's everybody ends up
16 seeing is what the remediation sites look like when we
17 are all done and how people use these remediation sites
18 and enjoy the park.

19 MR. DOWNING: But something to think about is
20 there already are land uses proscribed in the general
21 management plan amendment and Presidio Trust management
22 plan that show what the future land uses will be and to
23 some degree go into detail on what the vegetation
24 management resources will be.

25 MR. COOPER: Correct.

1 MR. ANDERSON: You might define what Area B
2 is.

3 MR. COOPER: Yeah. Okay. Well, I don't have
4 a good map, but the Presidio is divided into an Area A
5 and an Area B. But just to generally describe it, the
6 coastal region is the area of the Presidio administered
7 by the National Park Service. And the interior of the
8 Presidio is Area B, and it's administered by the
9 Presidio Trust.

10 MR. KERN: Area A is roughly 20 percent of the
11 Presidio, the outside border there on the coast. Area B
12 is about 80 percent, the interior.

13 MR. COOPER: What is interesting about this
14 remediation program is what the Presidio Trust is doing
15 with the \$100 million we got from the Army -- that was
16 to clean up remediation sites in both Area B and Area A.
17 So with the cleanup sites in Area A, we do coordination
18 with the Park Service to make sure that they're
19 comfortable with the remedies and the direction that
20 we're going for, the clean-ups that we're doing in the
21 part of the park that they have jurisdiction for
22 administering.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought it would be
24 useful to know, you have \$100 million to start with that
25 you've been whittling away at, presumably. What's the

1 MR. COOPER: All right. On the mustard agents
2 site, I'm going to talk about that in detail. We found
3 four bottles with residual mustard agents on it.
4 They've been taken away. We don't know of any other
5 chemical warfare agent at the Presidio right now.

6 As far as the degree of toxicity of the other
7 sites is your question then? Well, I would say as far
8 as human health exposure I personally -- it's a bit of a
9 judgment call -- I personally believe our lead-based
10 paint cleanup around a lot of the buildings is very
11 important as far as reducing risk to humans and the
12 petroleum. Several of our petroleum sites are basically
13 heavily contaminated with diesel fuel oil and things
14 like that. That's where we're going to find our highest
15 concentrations. At our landfill sites there's a couple
16 that would have some fairly high concentrations of
17 contaminants. And a lot of the other landfill sites
18 have moderate to very low concentrations of
19 contaminants, but they still need to be addressed.

20 MR. KERN: Undoubtedly, there will be many
21 other questions. There should be, and we will get to
22 those on the way. So I think for now perhaps we should
23 go back to the agenda, and as things come up feel free
24 to interact.

25 Do we have any other items under "Committee

1 sense of the adequacy of those funds to address all of
2 the known or likely issues?

3 MR. KERN: That's a really good question.
4 That's one that the community RAB members have been
5 working with the Trust staff to come up with a reporting
6 tool that can be useful for the public and also to
7 preserve confidentiality of the proprietary business
8 information of the Trust has that is so unique that way,
9 so that's a work in progress.

10 MR. COOPER: We have issued a couple months go
11 basically for each of our remediation sites -- and
12 there's more than 50, possibly -- a specific budget for
13 each site, what we think it's going to cost us. And
14 we're going to be tracking as it comes in so we can get
15 a better vision. But we have a vision for fully
16 remediating all the sites and staying under the
17 \$100-million target. That's our goal.

18 There is an environmental insurance policy
19 that the Presidio Trust has purchased. I don't want to
20 go into detail on that. I can talk to you about that.
21 It's not a cure-all for cost overruns, but it could help
22 us to some degree.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I assume the mustard
24 gas is the most dangerous thing you've got. What other
25 sites [inaudible]?

1 Business"? Any reports? Let's move on to Item 5-A.

2 MR. COOPER: Before I get started on this
3 presentation I want to do a brief introduction of
4 myself. George Ford here works for the Presidio Trust,
5 too, and he's going to have a talking role in this
6 presentation. I encourage him to do a brief
7 introduction of himself when he speaks.

8 Again, my name is Craig Cooper, and I've been
9 working for the Presidio Trust for about a year and for
10 about the last six months or so as head of environmental
11 remediation department. And basically welcome all
12 prospective RAB members.

13 I want to reiterate the way I perceive RAB
14 meetings is that they are really meetings for the
15 community members of the RAB, because myself and Tony
16 from the Park Service and Bob and Jim from the State of
17 California, we get to meet and talk on the phone and
18 discuss these sites as the course of our business almost
19 every day. And these meetings are really about getting
20 community input on what's going on. So, for example, I
21 don't drive the agenda items for the Park Service or the
22 State of California or the Presidio Trust. We don't
23 drive the agenda items. I call Mark Youngkin, the
24 community co-chair, and say, "What do you want to talk
25 about at the RAB meeting?" What do you want to talk

Page 21

1 about at the planning meeting? Then Mark tells me what
2 they want to talk about, and then I do homework and
3 prepare these presentations.

4 So I just want to say at the very beginning
5 that this isn't just a proscribed governmental
6 presentation every month, but it's basically the agenda
7 items driven by the community, and I think that's really
8 important.

9 Also, just briefly before I go into this,
10 just kind of a brief segue follow-up on Doug's
11 presentation and just as a little bit of background
12 about myself. I worked for the Environmental Protection
13 Agency for 15 years. Most of those years I worked on
14 federal Superfund site cleanups, so I've had a lot of
15 experience in dealing with remediation site cleanup and
16 dealing with community groups. And this particular
17 community group, the Presidio RAB -- not that it's just
18 present company -- but I am amazed by the level of
19 expertise that the RAB brings to the table and the
20 commitment to really try to get things done and get
21 things done right. As far as the Presidio Trust's
22 role -- and I also encourage that, Jim and Bob, when you
23 guys talk, talk about your role, as this is a good
24 opportunity to talk to folks here. As Doug said, the
25 Army transferred its authority over to the Presidio

Page 23

1 acronyms; and I did not tweak this presentation for all
2 the new members that we have here. So please stop me if
3 I say something that you don't understand. Just raise
4 your hand and I can stop. At Mark's request we were
5 asked to talk on two topics. Number one is to talk
6 about the mustard agent sites at Inspiration Point. I'm
7 going to talk a little bit about that briefly. I'm sure
8 you guys have heard about the articles in the San
9 Francisco Chronicle in mid-October that four bottles
10 with residual mustard agent were discovered by some Park
11 employees that were working on a native plant
12 restoration project over near Inspiration Point.

13 So once the finding was made, we at the
14 Presidio Trust were very concerned, because we didn't
15 think there was any leftover chemical warfare agents
16 here at the Presidio, but we have to remember it is a
17 former military base, so things like this can happen.

18 What we did we went and cordoned off the site,
19 did a quick inspection to make sure there wasn't any
20 other bottles laying on the ground in that area and we
21 implemented some site security and winterized the site
22 in advance of the winter rains that we've been having.
23 We contacted the Army because, as Doug said, mustard
24 agent qualifies as one of the few types of contamination
25 that the Army still has legal liability to respond to.

Page 22

1 Trust, and there are some documents that document all
2 that. And so we've got this \$100 million, so your job
3 is to get it done. We need to get the cleanups done and
4 hopefully get the budget and stay on schedule. So that
5 the heat is on us at the Presidio Trust because we're
6 the lead agency taking the action. Of course, we want
7 cost-effective cleanups from a risk perspective, but we
8 also want our cleanups to be fully understood by all the
9 stakeholders, especially community members, because that
10 is where you can do a great job. But if no one
11 understands where you're coming from, you may not get
12 any credit at the end of it or people still may not feel
13 safe about going to the remediation site, so I think
14 that a really important role of coming to these RAB
15 meetings is understanding how these cleanups are done.
16 You guys act as a very important voice in making sure
17 that we do cleanups in a way that the community
18 understands so they can be explained to folks and
19 park-users when we open up these remediation sites for
20 full public use.

21 Another big job that we have, of course, is
22 fixing data gaps that the Army left behind in a lot of
23 their investigation and then move forward and make
24 progress and get something going.

25 Now my presentation. Again, there's a lot of

Page 24

1 So the \$100 million budget didn't include any
2 budget to respond to mustard agent gas bottles at the
3 Presidio. So we contacted the Army. They brought
4 people here to take the bottles away and have them
5 tested and so on.

6 Now, I'm going to give the RAB a brief update
7 on what we've done since the last RAB meeting. What
8 we've done, we finished -- I'm assuming everybody knows
9 where Inspiration Point is. Maybe you've even walked in
10 that area and saw where we have installed a fence around
11 the area where the bottles were found. We installed a
12 fence because in that area we also noticed some trenches
13 in that area that we believe are actually former Army
14 foxholes when there was a small military combat training
15 zone. We don't know exactly what was going on there,
16 but to be on the safe side, since we don't know exactly
17 what this newly found site was used for, we put up a
18 security fence at the request of the State regulators to
19 keep people out of that area. We installed some signs
20 to tell people to stay out of the fenced area.

21 To give them some education on what was found
22 there, we had a neighborhood meeting on November 19th.
23 There's a lot of people that live here in the Presidio,
24 and we invited people who live on Quarry Road and
25 MacArthur avenue. Those are the two streets closest to

1 Inspiration Point and closest to the site where we found
2 the mustard agent bottles. That was a good meeting.
3 There was only maybe four or five, at the most,
4 community people or residents of the Presidio that came.

5 The feedback that I got from the Presidio
6 residents is that they are comfortable with the action
7 that the Trust has taken so far. We sent out a notice
8 to them right away because they were reading about it in
9 the newspapers, so they were likely to get upset, so
10 they were appreciative of that. I just basically told
11 them that they're welcome to come to RAB meetings, of
12 course, if they want to get more routine updates.

13 That's the the best way to get routine updates about
14 this particular site, and maybe down the road we'll have
15 another neighborhood meeting just for them.

16 I also wrote a formal letter to the Army
17 notifying them they have legal liability to do all the
18 long-term follow-up. Not only did they need to come and
19 take the bottles and have them tested, they have to know
20 the Presidio Trust is recommending that they do
21 appropriate follow-up actions. So I notified them of
22 that letter on November 14th.

23 Then I developed a technical scope of work of
24 what I think those follow-up actions should be, and I
25 sent that over to the State regulators on December 5th

1 area for all of our hazardous materials that we use to
2 operate the Park. So I'm thinking that might be an
3 appropriate place to temporarily store the soil. I'll
4 give you an update at the next RAB meeting on whether
5 the soil is going to stay there at the site, because
6 it's inside a fenced area so there's a barrier between
7 that and the public now. So we might keep it there or
8 we might take it over the Central Magazine.

9 The other thing that's happened since the last
10 RAB meeting is that Mark Youngkin did a little archive
11 search report himself about uses of potential chemical
12 warfare agents at the Presidio, and he made photocopies
13 of certain reports and sent that to me, which I
14 distributed to the State regulator and the Army.

15 So that's the past. Any questions maybe from
16 new members about what you've read in the papers and
17 want some clarification before we move on?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was wondering in
19 those cases whether the Army is starting [inaudible] how
20 responsive was the Army in responding to the fact that
21 was leftover ammunition that there was their
22 responsibility [inaudible]

23 MR. COOPER: When we told them that we found
24 bottles and we described the bottles, and they knew
25 right away that they were former mustard gas bottles.

1 for them to take a look at that.

2 Since the last RAB meeting the Army released a
3 little data report. When they collected those four
4 bottles they stripped off the residual mustard agent and
5 tested it, and they confirmed it was mustard agent and
6 some breakdown by-products of mustard agent. They sent
7 me that report, and I mailed it out to everybody on
8 November 22.

9 And this is kind of a new thing. If you go to
10 the site right now, you'll notice that there's two large
11 bins. They have tarps over them right now and they're
12 full of soil. And that is soil that has been scraped
13 from the site that hasn't been cleared as far as whether
14 there would be bottles inside the soil inside the bins.
15 But that's the Army's job to decide what to do with that
16 soil. And it's going to take them some time to mobilize
17 and come up with a plan for that. I might temporarily
18 relocate, if it makes sense -- I'm talking to Bob right
19 now and the Army person -- we might temporarily relocate
20 those two bins of soil. There's a little soil stockpile
21 that's tarped down. We might pick that up and put that
22 into the bin. We might move those bins just temporarily
23 over to an area called "Central Magazine." Central
24 Magazine is an old Army magazine that the Trust now
25 uses. Also, it's kind of a hazardous material storage

1 They're just four-ounce bottles, by the way. They
2 weren't warfare size. They were for combat training.
3 They responded immediately to that. What will be
4 interesting to see is that now that the bottles are gone
5 and to see what their strategy is going to be for
6 long-term follow-up. That remains to be seen. And in
7 January, as Doug said, the Army is going to come and
8 give us an overview on what the Army is recommending and
9 how to proceed as far as a long-term follow-up to this
10 issue, but they responded very quickly to our request to
11 come to the site and take the bottles away.

12 MR. DOWNING: Was there a magnometer test done
13 on the bins with the soil in them where the potential
14 contaminated soil is?

15 MR. COOPER: No, there wasn't. I don't think
16 it would work because the bin itself is metal.

17 MR. DOWNING: You could then put a
18 magnetometer in the middle of it?

19 MR. COOPER: I think the edge effects and
20 stuff -- I don't think it would work.

21 We intend to keep the fence up, even though
22 I've got one complaint about the fence already, by the
23 way. I know that we're going to probably continue to
24 get complaints about the fence because this was a
25 heavily used area of the Presidio but for the time being

Page 29

1 the fence needs to stay up and we need to maintain site
2 security to keep people out of that area.

3 I am going to send a letter after I get some
4 comments back from Bob about my technical scope of work.
5 I'm going to send a letter to the Army with my
6 recommendations about what I think they should do. And
7 we'll decide what to do about those couple of bins
8 inside the fenced area. That's not such a big deal.
9 The Army guy will come here in January. Then from that
10 point on, we will see what the Army is going to present
11 and prescribe for follow-up actions.

12 MR. O'HARA: Is it preliminary at this point
13 to discuss a protocol for technical remediation that is
14 proposed and that Bob is reviewing?

15 MR. COOPER: I can give you a thumbnail sketch
16 of my strategy. Basically since the Presidio Trust and
17 the Army have already done preliminary visual
18 inspections of the area and so there isn't any bottles
19 that are obviously lying around that could be an
20 immediate threat to public health anymore. But what we
21 don't know is some of these trenches/foxholes have been
22 exposed, but some kind of lead into a redwood forest
23 that sits right next to this area, and there's a whole
24 bunch of leaves and stuff that basically cover up the
25 foxholes in that area. And nobody has gone in there and

Page 31

1 contaminants at the Presidio and uses especially,
2 getting a better idea of these combat training zones --
3 what were they and what did they do there. So, in other
4 words, let's build an investigation from the ground up.
5 And to do that is find as much of the historical record
6 as you can first. So that's task number one.

7 Task number two is concurrent with shortly
8 after you've collected all these historical records and
9 you start to build basically a site conceptual model,
10 you might learn about these combat training zones and
11 learn about what type of activities that were being
12 conducted there.

13 And based on those historical records you can
14 start to put together these assumptions about what could
15 have happened, some what-if's. So that's called a site
16 conceptual model. So what I've asked the Army to do is
17 maybe bring the magnetometer and make a kind of field
18 instrument indication to either verify or deny some of
19 the site conceptual model. Is there a burial of bottles
20 there? We know that these bottles were actually carried
21 around in metal containers, so is there a burial site of
22 those? I've asked the Army to conduct some
23 characterization work inside the fenced area and then
24 Presidio-wide. Again, it's broken up into scopes of
25 work.

Page 30

1 removed all the leaves and done that. So, with that
2 said, we don't envision an immediate public health
3 threat, so we basically have time now to kind of build a
4 technically sound investigation from the ground up.

5 What my scope of work is recommending that the
6 Army do is conduct an archive search report basically
7 not only chemical warfare agents, but on any type of
8 chemical biological unexploded ordnance -- any type of
9 agents like that that the Army retains liability on.

10 And don't look at "Inspiration Point" as a
11 keyword search when you do your archive search. Let's
12 do this once and look at the whole Presidio.

13 So, actually, I broke the statement of work
14 into two statements of work: One for Inspiration Point
15 so that one can keep going and then one Presidio-wide.

16 So task number one is to do an archive search
17 report and look at military Army data about the
18 Presidio, not just at the archives here at the National
19 Park Service here at the Presidio. That's where Mark
20 looked, but what I think might have happened is that a
21 lot of data went there, but there's other military
22 archives spread out throughout the country, and I want
23 to make sure that the Army does a thorough archive
24 search report and look at all potential archives that
25 might be retaining data regarding these types of

Page 32

1 After doing that, I've asked the Army to
2 basically send me a memo assessing how risky they think
3 Inspiration Point is and, based on the historical
4 records and your characterization work, do you think
5 there's anything else there. And based on the
6 historical records and your characterization work have
7 you put together a site conceptual model that shows
8 there might be something there. The fence needs to stay
9 up and you need to do remediation work. Basically but
10 before we get there I'm just asking the Army to make
11 recommendations and that's basically the end of the
12 scope of work at that point in time because you can't
13 tell them to do work on something when we haven't found
14 any contamination yet

15 MR. O'HARA: Well, so they did field work and
16 cleaned out some of these peripheral foxholes to see
17 what they could find.

18 MR. COOPER: I've asked them -- in the
19 paragraph called "Characterization Work" -- I've asked
20 them to do that, not only bring out the magnetometer,
21 but I've also asked them to rake and remove the leaves
22 in the foxholes in the nonforested areas. Let's see how
23 they respond to that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So after they present
25 this information, is there an additional check on them,

1 or do you just review their information?

2 MR. COOPER: I'm not denigrating the Army. I
3 want them to do a good job, because Inspiration Point is
4 in Area B where the Presidio Trust is administering.
5 But as far as the regulator, I'm really looking to the
6 Department of Toxic Substances Control -- that's the
7 state regulator. They have jurisdiction at federal
8 facilities to regulate releases of hazardous substances,
9 so they'll be supervising the Army on that.

10 MR. BOGGS: In these investigations there's
11 built-in checks and balances QAQC parameters that they
12 have to follow. They have to use an independent lab
13 that isn't an Army employee so that this [inaudible]
14 will be checked by the EPA to make sure that they're
15 consistent in their analysis so there are safety checks
16 built into the system.

17 And, yes, I personally will be out there when
18 they're doing the investigation. I was out there the
19 day after the discovery with them. I was there every
20 time that they conducted these surveys to help answer
21 some questions. When we did a magnetometer survey, my
22 belt buckle interfered so these computers [inaudible].

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At some point did you
24 get the Army to admit whether there was mustard gas
25 cleanup elsewhere here?

1 that. It's for chemical, biological, and nuclear as
2 well as ordnance or unexploded ordnance. The Army
3 retains responsibility for those things at all bases.

4 MR. COOPER: It's certainly not in their
5 interest to do this because they have to remobilize and
6 come back. That's lot of extra expense instead of just
7 taking care of the problem before they leave.

8 MR. O'HARA: Without trying to minimize the
9 problem, I think it might be beneficial if you explained
10 exactly what you found and what the residual really was.
11 There's a lot of discussion about this, but when you
12 actually get down to what was discovered and the
13 probability of how it got there., , There's certainly
14 nothing deliberate. It had to be accidental.

15 MR. COOPER: Probably. That's why we have
16 [inaudible]. We have time to build the investigation
17 from the ground up and work out how much confidence we
18 have in the possibility of different factors here. But,
19 again, what was found was four 4-ounce bottles about
20 this big [indicating]. At my neighborhood meeting I had
21 pictures of them I could have handed out, but I think
22 only three of them had caps. They have little plastic
23 screw caps on top, and on three of them the caps were
24 missing and the contents had already been emptied out.
25 And even on the fourth one, where the cap was on, it had

1 MR. COOPER: If they have cleaned up.

2 MR. BOGGS: They have, in fact. They already
3 admitted that, and they've already listed 53 or 83
4 chemical agent sites that they have identified across
5 the U.S. Some are in various stages of investigation,
6 cleanup, et cetera

7 MR. COOPER: Across the U.S., but I don't
8 think they have ever admitted at the Presidio, no. They
9 have not admitted to any of that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you ask?

11 MR. COOPER: Did we ask? I think if there had
12 been cleanup, people would have known and it would have
13 been documented; and if it was incomplete it would have
14 been become a remediation site; and it would have gotten
15 on our tracking program as something that got
16 transferred over. So this is catching us off-guard.
17 This is not -- and the Army -- you have to give everyone
18 the benefit of the doubt. I think it's catching the
19 Army off-guard.

20 MR. BERMAN: I think that the Army would have
21 never agreed to the particulars of the MOI if they had
22 thought there was any chemical material left behind.

23 MR. BOGGS: The Army does standardly retain
24 liability for all of those conditions at all previous
25 bases, so it's actually a pretty standard way they do

1 been open and the contents had been removed and the cap
2 was put back on. So all that was really on these
3 bottles was just -- because the mustard agent itself is
4 very viscous at typical San Francisco temperatures, so
5 when you pour it out, all of it's not going to come out.
6 A lot of it's going to stick inside the bottle, so
7 that's really what we had left. Because of the time
8 frame that we believe the Army was using these types of
9 bottles was World War II, during the '40s, you can
10 imagine a bottle left on the ground with some viscous
11 kind of material on it. It wasn't liquid or viscous
12 anymore. It was just dried crystals that were stuck on
13 the bottle. And as far as a threat to public health, at
14 typical San Francisco temperatures, this type of
15 material basically freezes at -- I forgot -- at 55
16 degrees Fahrenheit. And at 58 degrees Fahrenheit it
17 becomes this very viscous material; and it will volatilize
18 very, very slowly. And it's a real public health threat
19 if it got really hot and -- you'd have to heat it up,
20 like in the military they will have the mustard agent
21 and then have a blasting agent with it and blow it up
22 and then the whole thing would become a gas, and it's
23 most toxic when the vapors are breathed in. But whether
24 we found they would put -- we had Army people put vapor
25 meters right over the bottles with the dried agents on

1 it and it would get no detect because it just doesn't
2 volatilize at typical San Francisco temperatures very
3 much.

4 I don't want to bias the investigation, but
5 what we think happened is that in this combat training
6 zone a couple soldiers just left and put some bottles on
7 the ground instead of taking them back in and having
8 them properly disposed of.

9 Are there only four bottles out there? That's
10 the question. I don't know. I hope so. I hope there's
11 no more bottles out there. Any other questions on this?

12 Now, talking about various remediation sites,
13 and RAB members like to hear various updates on how
14 we're doing and I've picked out a few of the RAB's most
15 popular remediation sites for an update. So I don't
16 want you to think that these particular sites that
17 myself and George talked about -- it's not the entire
18 universe, but it's probably the ones that have a lot of
19 activity going on right now and are some of our most
20 important ones.

21 The first one is what we call Landfill E -- by
22 the way all, the names for remediation sites are names
23 from the Army, and some of them have very interesting
24 and kind of nonlogical names, so you have to bear with
25 us on this.

1 Landfill E is a former Little League baseball
2 park at the end of Barnard Avenue. Landfill E-- Pop
3 Hicks Field -- I usually bring a map of the Presidio. I
4 didn't think of it this time, so at least for the next
5 several RAB meetings we'll make sure that we bring maps,
6 so anytime we talk about remediation sites we can point
7 to a map and get an idea or we can hand out maps. I've
8 got location maps showing each of the remediation sites
9 so you can get an idea of where each of those sites is
10 located. Then down the road we'll do tours and we'll
11 take you to all the remediation sites and you can walk
12 around and you can get more detail about each site. So
13 bear with me.

14 MR. BERMAN: As part of this report, will they
15 make an attempt to use the sampling to define the
16 lithological structure and where the groundwater is?
17 Just an overview of the lithology?

18 MR. COOPER: Yes. That was one of the goals
19 when we developed a sample analysis plan, to get a
20 better understanding of where the waste is in respect to
21 the water table in some aspects.

22 MR. BERMAN: Also, understanding what the
23 physical geology of the area is, because there was a
24 kind of preliminary model of that area, which is just a
25 guess. It's not based on any data as to what it looks

1 like in terms of not only depth of landfill but the
2 shape of it and where the ground water is and where the
3 rock formation is. There's serpentinite that goes out.
4 All that was just guesswork before.

5 MR. COOPER: All the fill work we took quite a
6 few borings, and we took -- we had geologists on the
7 site looking at the cores that were taken from these
8 borings. So to answer your question, yes, that's one of
9 the goals of this work plan. So we'll definitely have a
10 much upgraded idea of the site conceptual model for
11 Landfill E, including the geology.

12 MR. BERMAN: You might want to mention to our
13 audience that Landfill E is also the largest landfill on
14 the Presidio in sheer volume.

15 MR. COOPER: Except for 10, I think. That's
16 what we need Brian for. It's one of the biggest.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have any studies been
18 done on trees and vegetation in the areas immediately
19 adjacent to some of these landfills? Because I know
20 [inaudible] absorb a lot of that material and so do
21 trees.

22 MR. COOPER: As far as updates of
23 contaminants, you mean?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I know the Department
25 of Food and Agriculture had a big problem [inaudible]

1 where they had found several sites with [inaudible] bean
2 sprouts, that sort of thing. That's what I meant.

3 MR. COOPER: To answer your question, no, we
4 have not been testing vegetation for uptake of
5 contaminants. The vegetation on Landfill E right now is
6 pretty much wiped out. It's just a big grassy plain.
7 Up at the one end there are some eucalyptus trees that
8 might be growing into a waste area at the other end, but
9 a lot of landfills are -- not a lot is growing on them
10 right now. They're kind of unused waste areas.

11 MR. ANDERSON: You said something about
12 sampling wells without water. You mean there's no water
13 there, so you didn't sample or --

14 MR. COOPER: Correct. Some of the wells were
15 drained at a certain location. At this point in time
16 they didn't have water. We hope as the rainy season
17 comes along that the water table will come up and then
18 they will have water in them.

19 MR. PONTON: Do you know which wells those
20 are?

21 MR. COOPER: No. You'll have to give Chris a
22 call. Some have water already in, and one or two
23 didn't. Chris is the project manager that knows more
24 details on that, but I'm sure we'll have a update on
25 Landfill E every month for the next couple months.

Page 41

1 Another big important project area is over by
 2 the Public Health Service Hospital. On the far south
 3 side of the Presidio where 15th Avenue runs into the
 4 Presidio there's a big hospital which is vacant right
 5 now. And the Presidio Trust, in our management plan,
 6 that's where we have some certain ideas on how we want
 7 to redevelop that old hospital. But right next to the
 8 old hospital there's two landfills, Landfill 10 and
 9 Landfill 8. And the Army and the State came up with
 10 some remedies several years ago. Then the Presidio
 11 Trust had to do a basic review of those remedies to see
 12 if they're still protective of public health and the
 13 environment to figure out that we had to do some
 14 additional field work and kind of do some type of
 15 investigation boring and soil samples and things like
 16 that like we had at landfill E. We did the same thing
 17 at Landfill 10 and Landfill 8. Basically that data is
 18 coming and we're going to compile everything, and then
 19 early next year -- this is another five-year report
 20 because the remedy those landfills are five years old so
 21 when you're reviewing when you leave waste in place you
 22 just can't walk away from them. As Doug said, that
 23 remedy that leave waste in place need monitoring over
 24 time, also. And one of the environmental laws that we
 25 use -- the Superfund law, basically CERCLA by name --

Page 42

1 mandates that remedies that leave waste in place that
 2 the lead agency has to go back a minimum of every five
 3 years to check to make sure that that remedy is still
 4 protecting health and the environment. Stay tuned on
 5 that one. Maybe the remedy is okay, maybe not.
 6 The feasibility study. All right. This thing
 7 is a very standard document that's basically it's when
 8 you design what's the best remedy for a remediation
 9 state that has hazardous substances in it. It's not for
 10 the lead sites and it's not for the petroleum sites, but
 11 it's what we call for CERCLA sites. The Army wrote a
 12 Presidio feasibility study and that's the one that the
 13 RAB rejected in total, I guess. So there was a big
 14 redo, basically, on the feasibility study. And when we
 15 at the Presidio Trust took over we also decided that
 16 before we could even redo the feasibility study and come
 17 up with new recommendations for a lot of these hazardous
 18 substance sites, there was a lot of big data gaps at
 19 these sites, so we couldn't then do a fair analysis to
 20 come up with a good remedy. So we had to go out and
 21 collect some more data, put that into the mix and then
 22 analyze the data and then come up with a new revised
 23 remedy for each of our hazardous substances or CERCLA
 24 remediation sites.
 25 Before we can release the feasibility study to

Page 43

1 the state regulators, there's a two-step process that
 2 the Trust has to do. So we first release it to the
 3 National Park Service, which we have just done. So the
 4 National Park Service now has the draft feasibility
 5 study for about 30 remediation sites in it. And it has
 6 the Presidio Trust's recommended remedy for those sites,
 7 so it's a really important document and the Park Service
 8 takes a look at it first and gives us comments. And
 9 once the Trust and the Park Service reach an agreement,
 10 then we send it out to the State regulators and the RAB.
 11 And basically you guys get to look at draft documents,
 12 which is, I think, a great way to get public input on
 13 documents before they become final, but I would like to
 14 say that it's very unusual.
 15 MR. KERN: Not at the beginning.
 16 MR. COOPER: It's very unusual. I think it's
 17 a new thing to do for RABs, not only for federal
 18 facilities, but I know Superfund sites like Dow Chemical
 19 would never want to send a draft document to the public.
 20 That is just not done. But at least at federal
 21 facilities we're basically warming up to the concept
 22 because it gets comments and buy-in early on and tries
 23 to prevent a lot of redos that the Army just went
 24 through.
 25 MS. CHEEVER: Can I add something for the

Page 44

1 historical record? It's true that most of the RAB
 2 either individually or in a group objected to the Army's
 3 feasibility study. We were only one of many who found
 4 issue with it. The Trust itself, which hadn't yet taken
 5 over the cleanup, found a lot of problems with it. The
 6 Park Service found a lot of problems with it. Other
 7 agencies found a lot of problems with it, a lot of local
 8 citizen groups. So we were just one of many groups that
 9 wasn't. We were in no way alone.
 10 MR. COOPER: Good point. There were others,
 11 including the Presidio Trust, that wasn't happy with it.
 12 And it should also be said --
 13 MS. CHEEVER: There were members of the RAB
 14 who did like it.
 15 MR. COOPER: That's what I was going to say.
 16 Sometimes there are people that will come from a more
 17 conservative approach to remediation and members of the
 18 public that don't mind waste being left in place and
 19 things like that, so that's the beauty and pain of
 20 public participation. But there's a very wide opinion
 21 in environmental remediation, and RAB members try to
 22 provide room for all types of voices to be presented.
 23 And I think so that's an important point.
 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the range of
 25 contaminants that are out there? Can you give us a very

Page 45

1 general idea of the ones that you might leave in place
2 versus the ones that are more likely to feel like you
3 have to get out of there?

4 MR. COOPER: In our landfill sites, what we
5 typically have been finding are elevated levels of
6 metals -- your typical cadmiums and chromiums and lead.
7 We oftentimes find pesticides in the landfills also, and
8 occasionally we'll find some chlorinated solvents here
9 and there. There hasn't been really any hits of
10 trichloroethylene that you typically find at a lot of
11 other big hazardous substance sites. We find petroleum
12 in our landfill sites too, but that's generally the
13 description.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is background. In
15 addition, are there other parties or actors in addition
16 to the RAB here that are involved? Are there other
17 agencies -- state, federal -- or is it just who is here?

18 MR. COOPER: I think the people here are the
19 primary players. In the decision making of what's going
20 on at these remediation sites, there's Federal EPA they
21 have basically backed off. And for the time being, they
22 can come back at any time, I guess, but we're it
23 basically.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mentioned mainly
25 landfills and things of that nature, but do you get

Page 47

1 outside of buildings is that we want to make sure that
2 that it is abated and encapsulated properly before we do
3 the cleanup of the soil underneath it; otherwise, we
4 don't want the soil to get recontaminated. But that's
5 an important interaction and I talked to the lead
6 abatement person a lot about that.

7 And so the department of the Presidio Trust
8 needs to be really coordinated with the abatement
9 program so when we do environmental cleanups, we do them
10 once and in a final fashion and not recontaminate
11 things.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In addition to the
13 landfills, you also have petroleum usually in leaks or a
14 dump or something.

15 MR. COOPER: Petroleum, right. I would say
16 if we were going to do a bar graph of the mass of
17 contaminants at the Presidio, the petroleum bar on that
18 would be extremely high with other contaminants having
19 smaller medium bar graphs. Even though we talk about
20 these hazardous substances sites and the landfill sites
21 a lot, that's just because by volume, they're extremely
22 large and they are full of a lot of construction debris
23 and knocked-down buildings, but there's some hazardous
24 substances, basically, mixed in with that debris, and so
25 we need to take an action on them. And a lot of people

Page 46

1 involved in toxic substances found in the buildings on
2 the Presidio?

3 MR. COOPER: That's a whole different program
4 for asbestos and lead-based paint that's still inside
5 the buildings. That would not trigger the environmental
6 laws that we use in the remediation program, but the
7 Presidio Trust has an abatement program in place where
8 we do abate asbestos and lead-based paint in an
9 appropriate fashion. So we could have a guest speaker,
10 for example, one night and have our abatement person
11 come and talk about that, if the RAB is interested.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But you're not involved
13 in that at all?

14 MR. COOPER: No. My department is not
15 involved in it, and the RAB is not involved in it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because once there's
17 construction on any of these buildings you've got
18 friable problems with all the in-place asbestos, and
19 that's going to be released right there.

20 MR. COOPER: We do it in a way that there
21 isn't a release.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Encapsulated or removed
23 before the work's done so that you don't have a release?

24 MR. COOPER: One really important interaction
25 with the abatement program for lead-based paint on the

Page 48

1 in the community are very interested in them because the
2 remediation of those sites will play a very important
3 role in the restoration and the vegetation management
4 plan. That's why there's a lot of interest in the large
5 landfill sites. But as far as mass of contaminants, the
6 petroleum sites are definitely the winners.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just wanted an update
8 on [inaudible]. Understanding that the Presidio is
9 separate from the City, does the City play any role?
10 And is there any interest, or do they want to run away
11 from cleaning it up and any liability that there may be?

12 MR. COOPER: That's a good question. The City
13 does not play a role in the remediation of those sites.
14 It's federal property and so they don't have any
15 particular jurisdiction. Except for underground storage
16 tank program or tank closures, we don't send
17 notification of closures to the City. They have to give
18 final buy-off on that, but that's more of a regulatory
19 role that's been delegated to them. We oftentimes have
20 a permit to discharge to the sanitary sewer under
21 certain conditions. That's a City and County authorized
22 permit. Maybe at Mountain Lake, because it is a
23 remediation site that you'll be hearing a lot about.
24 And the City property at Mountain Lake kind of cuts in
25 there, so there will be some coordination with the City

1 at Mountain Lake.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Well, about six years ago there
3 was a city representative on the RAB. And, secondly,
4 another point to make is that any governmental agency,
5 just like any individual, can put a comment on
6 something. So if there were ever an issue that affected
7 the City, it doesn't have to be on the RAB to have its
8 voice heard and submit a comment, for instance, on your
9 revised feasibility study,.

10 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. Yes. In fact, one
11 last thing on the feasibility study, the RAB basically
12 gets to look at a preview, a draft, of the feasibility
13 study. The next step of the feasibility study is
14 basically soliciting public comment on the feasibility
15 study and the vehicle. We do that by a document called
16 the "proposed plan". I don't want to overwhelm you with
17 a lot of jargon, but that's where we get input from the
18 greater public outside of this room. The Presidio Trust
19 issues a document called the proposed plan, which
20 summarizes the feasibility study and what we think the
21 right remedies are and we put ads in the newspaper and
22 we mail it out to this larger distribution list and we
23 have special public meetings and public comment periods
24 for the greater public to comment on things. So there's
25 RAB committees and then there's the greater public that

1 the sites. With unacceptable risks you have to do a
2 cleanup and clean them back to acceptable risk again.
3 Risk is defined in terms of human health risk and
4 ecological risk. That's what CERCLA says. Then
5 RI/FS is a regional investigation that's going
6 out and taking soil samples and water samples to figure
7 out how contaminated an area is. That's how you figure
8 out how risky it is.

9 So one of the areas of many projects that we
10 have is that the Army has small-arms firing ranges
11 throughout the Presidio. The firing ranges haven't been
12 fully investigated at all. So that's why we are having
13 to go out and do this remedial investigation. Treadwell
14 and Rollo is one of the Trust's consultants that
15 developed a work plan. And we want to get this bid, so
16 we're doing to be kicking off a big investigation next
17 year of the small-arms firing ranges. There's five of
18 them throughout the Presidio. So we're in the earlier
19 stages of the investigation of those.

20 Closing out our discussion of these CERCLA
21 sites, Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 -- that's an
22 Army name -- "disturbed areas," "fill sites,"
23 "landfills" -- it's all basically the same thing. It's
24 just the Army's names for places where they dump stuff
25 and debris and waste and contamination. Baker Beach

1 comments on certain proposed plans and remedies.

2 To give you just a bird's-eye view of some of
3 our CERCLA sites --

4 MR. KERN: If you could, just mention CERCLA
5 and what that stands for.

6 MR. COOPER: Okay. It's a Federal Superfund
7 law, Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation
8 and Liability Act. So that's what the Federal EPA uses
9 to clean up releases of hazardous substances to the
10 environmental and get cost recovery and people can sue
11 each other. It's a really broad act that was passed by
12 Congress in 1980.

13 And it's called Superfund because within that
14 law there was a tax on oil and chemical companies that
15 created about a \$4-5 billion trust fund that the Federal
16 EPA was able to use the cleanup sites outside of federal
17 facilities such as the Presidio and military bases.
18 They have their own funding source. They will still use
19 the CERCLA law. There's a section in CERCLA that
20 explains how the Army and the federal facilities should
21 use this law, but that tax has expired about eight years
22 ago and the Superfund EPA is basically out of money.
23 That's just a historical sidenote on that

24 This law is what we use and the law basically
25 mandates doing an investigation to figure our risks for

1 Disturbed Area obviously is up on the coastal bluffs
2 overhanging Baker Beach. There's a whole bunch of these
3 disturbed areas or landfills, and the first two that the
4 Trust is going to clean up are in Area A, so we have to
5 work with the Park Service very closely on its cleanup.
6 Our Disturbed Areas 3 and 3 and then Fill Site 6 is a
7 landfill area right here in Area B just right off
8 Lincoln Boulevard and Gerard. So, anyway, when I take
9 you on a tour, I'll point those out to you.

10 We are working on a document called the
11 "Remedial Action Plan." That's the decision document,
12 and before we send this out, actually, we'll do a
13 proposed plan for this proposed remedy of how to clean
14 these three sites. So not only will the RAB comment,
15 the greater public will comment on this particular
16 cleanup.

17 MS. CHEEVER: So is this cleanup scheduled for
18 next year?

19 MR. COOPER: We have one cleanup actually
20 scheduled in January of next year that George is going
21 to talk about, but I would guess for mid to late next
22 year. So stay tuned on that.

23 Then the one after this group of sites we have
24 another grouping of sites. All these sites will be
25 coming out of our feasibility study that I talked about,

1 Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1 and 2 -- the other two
2 kinds of landfill sites hanging over Baker Beach. And
3 that's a year behind this one, so these are scheduled
4 for mid to late 2003; and these sites are scheduled for
5 cleanup in 2004-2005.

6 We have a whole series of basically proposed
7 plans and decision documents that have to be made every
8 year for the next three or four years if we're going to
9 be able to continue our cleanup and get construction
10 completed in the next seven to ten years. So we have a
11 lot of decisions to make and a lot of cleanup work to
12 do.

13 Just about every building at the Presidio is a
14 potential lead-based paint site. Thirty-three percent
15 have been sampled so far. And, based on our sampling,
16 about half required cleanup. And we've only cleaned up
17 37 sites, so we need to get that program in gear. The
18 Trust is about ready to release a document to the
19 regulators that kind of sets up the protocols for how we
20 do these cleanups, and the community and the public will
21 have an opportunity to comment on that.

22 I'm done talking.

23 MR. KERN: Probably a good time for a break.

24 [A break was taken from 8:35 until 8:50.]

25 MR. FORD: I guess I'll start out talking

1 fairly typical that there's nearly a two-year lead time
2 in the planning and cleanup paperwork process that we
3 have to go through before we get down to actually
4 digging.

5 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 had a RAP approved
6 in September of this year. The job was put out to bid
7 in August and September. And we actually awarded the
8 dig -- it's a simple dig-it-up-and-haul-it-away landfill
9 cleanup -- to a company called EERG, which was based in
10 Concord. The Trust made that award in mid-October and
11 started making preparations to begin removing the
12 landfill.

13 During the ten-day period after the award that
14 bid protests are allowed, one actually came in. The
15 second lowest bidder, which is a company called
16 Performance Excavators in San Rafael, made a formal
17 protest that the low-bidder contractors license was not
18 in order. They had a fairly technical argument about a
19 defect in their contractors license and strongly urged
20 the Trust not to award the work to the low bidder on the
21 grounds that there was a problem with their license.

22 The Trust spent roughly a month evaluating
23 that protest and, in a nutshell, concluded that the
24 license of the low bidder is valid as far as we can
25 tell. Basically, the Contractors State License Board

1 about Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. Following up on
2 Craig's introduction, I'll introduce myself. My name is
3 George Ford. I'm a geologist by training, actually an
4 engineering geologist, which means that I'm qualified to
5 stand outdoors and talk really loud and wave my arms,
6 which turns out to be perfect for what I do now at the
7 Presidio, which is I manage the actual cleanups that we
8 do. The Trust has done a number of small petroleum
9 cleanups in the last three years and is just now getting
10 started on the first larger CERCLA cleanups, which are
11 basically landfills.

12 The first big one that we have coming up are
13 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. They are both just
14 landfills. There's no significance in the different
15 names. A landfill is the same as a fill site. Both of
16 these sites are located on Robb Hill, which is the
17 highest point in the Presidio. They are near the
18 intersection of Washington Boulevard and Kobbe Avenue,
19 also, near Central Magazine. So they're kind of along
20 the western edge of the Presidio. Some of you may know
21 the Robb Hill campgrounds, which is adjacent to Landfill
22 4, where the World War II Sailors Memorial, which is
23 adjacent to Fillsite 5. We have been working on getting
24 the cleanup paperwork in place for these projects for
25 about roughly 20 months now. So it's turning out to be

1 has repeatedly assured us that the license is valid. So
2 the Trust basically continues forward relying on the
3 contractors licensing board's determination that the
4 license is good.

5 So that resulted in the bid protest being
6 delayed, which occurred on November 25th. And on that
7 day we started up again, getting ready to remove these
8 landfills.

9 EERG, the low bidder, is now putting together
10 a health and safety plan. They have to do a sampling
11 plan for characterizing the fill. They also have to do
12 a storm water control plan, an erosion control plan, and
13 a few other things like that. They are churning out
14 those documents furiously, and we're reviewing them as
15 fast as they come in.

16 Our goal is to start bringing equipment out to
17 the job sites on or about the 6th of January, which is
18 actually the first Monday in the New Year.

19 We hope it won't rain very much in January,
20 and if any have you have any connection that allows you
21 to control rainfall, we'd appreciate saving the rain for
22 March. Let's have it dry in January and February.

23 MR. O'HARA: From a strategic standpoint, how
24 are you going to do this? Are you going to do one and
25 then the other, or are you going to do both at the same

1 time, or --

2 MR. FORD: We're going to do one and then the
3 other. We're doing them in numerical order. We decided
4 to allow the contractor to pick the order he wants to do
5 them in. They have told us they want to do Landfill 4
6 first because it's smaller. Basically the idea is
7 Landfill 4 is smaller and it's back in the woods, so we
8 can go back there, get used to working with each other,
9 make any mistakes we have to make, and get the landfill
10 removal machine humming, working on a small site back in
11 the woods.

12 Then when we come out to Fill Site 5, which
13 should be roughly around the 1st of February, we should
14 be used to working with them; and presumably the process
15 will go more smoothly. That's how we're hoping it will
16 go.

17 There are competing interests within the
18 Trust. I know that the people who look at bird nesting
19 prefer that we do Landfill 4 first because there are owl
20 and hawk nests in the trees around Landfill 4. So the
21 bird people would rather have us doing the digging in
22 January and get out of there before the birds show up.
23 The native plant folks would actually prefer that we do
24 it in the opposite order because they would like to have
25 Fill Site 5 done first so that can get the native plants

1 in the ground as early as possible so that they will be
2 rained on for as long as possible, so every group within
3 the Trust, and to a lesser extent the Park Service, has
4 their own opinion about what order we should do them in.

5 We're going to do 4 first and then 5. It just
6 makes sense. Landfill 4 is about 6500 cubic yards,
7 which is a relatively small job, and Fill Site 5 can be
8 30,000-35,000 yards, so it's a lot bigger. I think it
9 also makes sense to start out on a small one.

10 We should update, I hope, at the next full RAB
11 meeting, which will be the second Tuesday in January.
12 We'll actually have some pictures of the work starting
13 up. So that should be interesting to see.

14 There's a last administrative item on this
15 project, which we, the Trust, in the work plan for this
16 project in the responsiveness summary, we mixed some of
17 the DTSC's comments with Jim Ponton's comments and
18 misattributed comments to Jim that he didn't make, so we
19 are issuing an amended responsiveness summary to the
20 work plan, so for those of you who get these documents
21 directly in the mail, there will be a small package.
22 That's the amended work plan. It doesn't change the
23 remedy. It really has no technical or administrative
24 effect on the project. We're still doing exactly the
25 same job that we planned to do. It's just that we had

1 some mistakes in there that we wanted to correct before
2 the document became part of the permanent record.

3 Any questions?

4 MR. BERMAN: Suppose that, in fact, January
5 and February turn out to be really wet. What's the
6 worst that would happen with the ongoing effort?

7 MR. FORD: The worst that could happen is that
8 it would take us longer to do it. The contract has all
9 kinds of provisions for rain delays. On a digging
10 operation like this, the way it goes, a drizzly day you
11 work there. A good rain costs you just the day that the
12 rain is falling. A hard rain can sometimes cost you
13 three days or a week if the site gets too wet, because
14 of an intense rain you really have to shut down the
15 operation for several days until things dry out. We'll
16 just keep track of it and keep going along.

17 Under ideal conditions, we can probably get
18 both of those landfills out of there in six weeks. If
19 we have a lot of rain, it could take eight or ten weeks.
20 We will have to work around the rain storms.

21 MR. BERMAN: Is there any thinking, since
22 you're going to do them in a series, that if you do have
23 rain and these delays, is there any way to skip ahead?
24 Say this happens during Landfill 4 excavation. Is there
25 some preliminary work that you can do in 5 while you're

1 waiting for dryouts to occur?

2 MR. FORD: There is. And the contractor is
3 already looking at that. They will probably go up and
4 fence Landfill 4 first and set up their project offices
5 and get ready to do that, then work on Landfill 4. If
6 they get rained out at 4, it's likely they'll go down to
7 5 and start installing the perimeter silt fences for
8 erosion control. They will have a long list of chores
9 that they can do that don't involve heavy ground
10 disturbance. So they will be doing those things to keep
11 themselves busy.

12 If ultimately the rain does slow us down, we
13 will be pushing them to move as quickly as they can, but
14 we also have to be cognizant of the fact that we have
15 the ability to turn it into an unholy mess up there.
16 And we don't want to do that. We don't want to be
17 tracking contaminated mud all up and down the streets or
18 having problems with storm water getting loose, so we're
19 going to go as fast as we can, but we have to try to be
20 measured and deliberate about it.

21 MR. BERMAN: What route are they choosing to
22 haul off? Are they going across the Golden Gate or are
23 they going down the Peninsula?

24 MR. FORD: That actually hasn't been settled
25 yet. The contractor has specified a number of landfills

Page 61

1 that they might use to send the waste off to.
 2 My guess is that most of the waste will go off
 3 to a Class II landfill either in Stockton or in the
 4 Altamont near Livermore. And that haul route they use
 5 for that will most likely be north across the Golden
 6 Gate Bridge and then through the East Bay. But legally
 7 they have the option of going south out through Doyle
 8 Drive and Lombard. I've never heard of a trucker who
 9 wants to do that, so I don't think that they will, but
 10 it's a state highway that runs through San Francisco so
 11 they are allowed to use it. It isn't definite yet, but
 12 I think it is a high probability that the majority of
 13 truck traffic will go up Lincoln Boulevard and get on
 14 the bridge at the toll plaza and go out to the north.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there Class I
 16 material?

17 MR. FORD: We don't think the contract has a
 18 provision for hauling Class I in case we encounter
 19 anything that meets that classification but I'll be
 20 surprised if we have much. And if we do, it's likely to
 21 be sort of your garden-variety Class I, it most likely
 22 would be soil with lead in it just over the limit or may
 23 be that if there was a waste extraction test abd in the
 24 spectrum of hazardous wastes that kind of stuff is
 25 pretty much near the bottom. It's not the worst but the

Page 62

1 trucks will all be covered and it will be used to the
 2 same precaution for hauling anything basically. When it
 3 goes out, the truck tires will be broomed off, covers
 4 are mandatory, and all that stuff.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any provision
 6 for notifying the neighbors of Class I in the Presidio?

7 MR. FORD: No. We have not put anything in
 8 place to notify -- I don't think there are any
 9 residential neighbors on the outbound haul route. So
 10 I'm not sure. I suppose we can notify the neighbors,
 11 but most of them will be fairly distant from the action.

12 We are putting notifications in the Presidio
 13 Post to try to make people generally aware that there
 14 will be a big hauling operation. I suspect that the
 15 effect will be more noticeable because of the truck
 16 traffic in the daytime. I don't really expect there to
 17 be any hazardous exposure issues.

18 The biggest danger is that there will be a lot
 19 of trucks. There will be something like 60 to 90
 20 truckloads a day leaving the Presidio for a month or
 21 two.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a little bit of
 23 experience in the hauling of trucks, especially if the
 24 tires are wet and muddy. That's one of the key elements
 25 to focus on, trying to keep that, prior to the

Page 63

1 operation, clean so that you don't have these street
 2 cleaners or some sort of provision for getting out there
 3 just to clean off truck tires [inaudible]

4 MR. FORD: We're trying to focus a lot of
 5 attention on that. The contractors are going to be
 6 setting up a wheel-washing station at the exit point
 7 from both landfills. When they're hauling dry they'll
 8 be brooming off the tires. And when it's wet they'll be
 9 using the pressure washer. I think they're going to
 10 have a street sweeper. And the Trust has a street
 11 sweeper, so we're going to work pretty hard to try to
 12 run a tidy operation. And my phone number will be all
 13 over the signs, so if anybody sees any muddy trails that
 14 don't look right feel free to call me up, and I will
 15 yell at somebody and get it cleaned up.

16 I can quickly go over the petroleum program.
 17 We met with Jim Ponton on November 5th and discussed the
 18 status of the Trust's compliance with the Water Board's
 19 orders that apply to the Presidio. And we have put
 20 together a follow-up letter that we promised that we
 21 would send Jim, and it is going over to the Park Service
 22 tomorrow morning for them to review. They'll review it
 23 when Bruce Ullensvang gets back into town later this
 24 week. After the Trust and the Park Service have agreed
 25 on it, then we will send a draft for everybody to look

Page 64

1 at.

2 That letter will summarize what the Army and
 3 the Trust have done to comply with the Water Board's
 4 orders. It'll also describe some improvements that the
 5 Trust will be making in the way we report things to the
 6 Water Board just to bring us into closer compliance with
 7 the orders, so everybody should be able to see that
 8 draft letter before the end of the year. We will mail
 9 out hard copies and e-mail them.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Could you state in a sentence or
 11 two what the two sites are? Are the two sites both on
 12 the same site?

13 MR. FORD: No, they're different. The first
 14 order is Order 9-082. And the Water Board will document
 15 that order.

16 MR. PONTON: The Water Board documents --

17 MR. FORD: The Water Board adopted an order
 18 in, I believe, March of 1991, and it focuses
 19 specifically on contamination at Building 937, which is
 20 a former airplane hangar down at the west end of Crissy
 21 Field and also on contamination at Building 231, which
 22 is a former Army gas station that is adjacent to Halleck
 23 Street. At the time the order came out, these were both
 24 known to be pretty heavily contaminated assignments.
 25 They were both contaminated with petroleum. The

1 Building 937 site, the former airplane hangar at the
2 west end of Crissy Field, was thought to be contaminated
3 by a leaking oil tank. It may have been a waste oil
4 tank that was under the floor underneath the building.
5 The Army has since removed the tank and has performed
6 several rounds of cleanup. And the Trust has actually
7 installed monitoring wells in the area and has started
8 monitoring them. So we think that right now it is in
9 reasonably good shape.

10 The Building 231 area had a very severe leak.
11 The Army had something like four 10,000-gallon
12 underground storage tanks there. As far as we can tell,
13 they all leaked. It was a very severe leak of gasoline
14 and diesel and fuel oil into the subsurface. The Trust
15 is investigating that area right now. The Army did some
16 kind of interim cleanups there. They took tanks out but
17 they never solved the entire problem. The Trust is in
18 the process of taking a look at the whole Building 231
19 area defining where all the contamination is and then
20 coming up with a plan to treat it.

21 The plan that we are working on is called a
22 "Corrective Action Plan." That's the term. It's the
23 plan that governs cleanup of petroleum at a site where
24 you have a severe leak that affects ground water. So
25 that's first. The Water Board order covers those two

1 sort of rules and regulations for how that soil
2 treatment process is supposed to go. The Army shut down
3 their soil burner some years ago before the Trust ever
4 came on the scene, and we have not done anything like
5 that. That part of the order is not being used actively
6 right now.

7 Both of the Board orders also require that we
8 make periodic reports to the Water Board of our progress
9 in cleaning up petroleum contamination all over the
10 Presidio.

11 That was a long answer to a short question,
12 but I guess I'm known for that.

13 We have a second document that has been on the
14 burner for about 18 months and is finally getting ready
15 to come out. It's a draft petroleum cleanup plan.

16 I guess the way to differentiate this item on
17 the second bullet from the thing I was talking about in
18 the first bullet is the first bullet is going to be a
19 summary of kind of the administrative procedures and the
20 administrative status of petroleum cleanup at the
21 Presidio.

22 The second bullet, the draft cleanup plan will
23 be just that. It'll talk about the mechanics of how
24 we're going to clean these things up, which order we
25 plan to do, which sites, and that sort of thing. So

1 sites.

2 The second Board order is No. 96-070. And the
3 Board adopted that in the middle of 1996. That order
4 has kind of a more general function in that he did
5 maintaining that does establish cleanup petroleum
6 cleanup levels for soil in the Presidio, so when we
7 pulled the tank out and then we find that it leaked, if
8 we started digging soil we go and pull out this 1996
9 Board order and look at it because it has tables in
10 there that define what has to be removed and what is
11 allowable to leave in the ground.

12 The 1996 Board order also had some other
13 provisions that were applied to some work that the Army
14 was doing that the Trust no longer does. The main thing
15 there is for a few years the Army had essentially a soil
16 burner. It was called a "low-temperature thermal
17 desorption unit." It was basically an oven that you put
18 contaminated soil in and it cooked the petroleum out of
19 it. The Army used that to treat badly contaminated soil
20 that had a lot of petroleum in it for a period of about
21 three years. They put dirty soil in and cooked the
22 petroleum out. They would take cooked soil that came
23 out of the other end of the machine and use that usually
24 to backfill other cleanup excavations.

25 And the second part of the Board order what is

1 it's about five pages with some tables and, I think,
2 provides a reasonably concise summary of what has to be
3 still done at the Presidio.

4 I should point out, too, we have achieved the
5 point where we believe that with few exceptions we have
6 removed all underground storage tanks at the Presidio.
7 The only place where any are left -- there are four
8 tanks left underneath the basement floors of four
9 individual residential units on Portola Avenue, and the
10 units are occupied. That's the only reason we've left
11 the tanks in.

12 We found it's not a good idea to remove tanks
13 while the tenants are still in the buildings, because
14 it's messy and it's stinky and nobody likes burly men
15 running up and down their basement stairs with shovels
16 and buckets. So we are basically waiting. As soon as
17 the leases are up and the units become vacant, we will
18 go back in and get those last four tanks.

19 At that point, we will have no more
20 underground storage tanks that we know of. We might
21 discover a few unknown ones from time to time, but I
22 think it's kind of an important milestone that we've
23 finally got to the end of the ones we know about.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: How many have you taken out?

25 MR. FORD: About 40 so far. I think the Army

1 took out about 200 and we have taken out 40.

2 A few other odds and ends. The skeet range
3 cleanup. For those of you who are new, the Army had a
4 skeet range down at Crissy Field. It was towards the
5 west end of the field, where they would shoot out
6 towards the water. The net effect of years and years of
7 skeet shooting out there was some lead contamination in
8 the soil.

9 Actually, the more significant amount of
10 contamination is what we call PAH's, which are
11 polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. Those are little
12 clay birds that, in the old days were made out of
13 essentially chalk that added glue that held it together
14 and it was really cheap pottery. It's like a cheap
15 saucer that you'd put a coffee cup on. They were made
16 out of chalk that was bound together by a glue, and the
17 glue was made out of coal tar. And the coal tar
18 contained these polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. As
19 the skeet targets would be shot, they would break into
20 pieces and kind of fly out onto the beach and in the
21 water. They spread out the PAH contamination over a
22 certain area.

23 The Army did a partial cleanup of the skeet
24 range in 1998. But they basically worked northward
25 until they hit the Crissy Field beach, and then they

1 stopped.

2 One of the projects that the Trust inherited
3 was the responsibility to clean up the beach, and so we
4 have been working on that. We spent a year or so
5 exploring it and then actually did the digging last
6 summer to clean up the skeet fragments. We are now
7 working on a closure report, and the consultant is
8 trying to run down some odds and ends with the
9 analytical work. That's sort of the norm. There are
10 frequently loose ends on reports like this that have to
11 be run down.

12 One other thing that has come up which you may
13 or may not have heard of: In late November in a big
14 storm, we had some erosion in some of the areas where we
15 had done cleanup on the beach. In our judgment, it
16 looked like some erosion was occurring because of the
17 cleanup work we had done, that some of the backfill soil
18 we had put in was weaker than the soil that had been
19 there and was eroded out so we think we need to do some
20 repairs down there to restore the beach to the condition
21 it was in before we did the cleanup. We want to make
22 sure that when we're done the objectives of the cleanup
23 have been achieved and that the beach is stable and that
24 it looks pretty much like it looked when we started. So
25 in the next few months we'll come up with a plan to move

1 a little riprap around out there and bring in some more
2 sand, kind of tidy up and finish out the project that we
3 did.

4 Fillsite 7 is a landfill that used to be where
5 the Crissy Field marsh now sits. The Trust did some
6 sampling on that about a year ago and is putting
7 together a closure report using some of the Army's data
8 and the questions that regenerated. That report is
9 still being reviewed. I guess we have draft comments
10 from Jim. We'll be getting some comments from Bob
11 pretty soon. Once we have those comments and actually
12 revise the report. We hope to get it and close that
13 out. Any questions on that one?

14 A few of the items on Crissy Field: The
15 Building 9 area construction completion report that's
16 been reviewed once again by the Trust and the Park
17 Service. Treadwell and Rollo is working on a revised
18 draft. That should be coming out, I think, in January.

19 Then, the overall Crissy Field closure and
20 request for site certification. We have a draft report
21 on that that we're looking at, if we think it's good
22 enough we'll send it to the Park Service, and after
23 we've agreed with them that will also come out for
24 everybody to review.

25 DEH closure. The DEH is an area on the east

1 end of Crissy Field that actually had its own remedial
2 action plan separate from the Crissy Field plan. The
3 Trust has a draft report that we sent to another agency
4 a while ago, which I gather they're looking at. And I
5 see from three bullet items here there's a revised
6 report that the Trust and the Park Service are currently
7 working on. And after we get that squared away we will
8 sit down with the Water Board and DGSC to try to put
9 together a punchlist of what are the final things that
10 need to be done to achieve closure on the DEH area. And
11 that should be happening early in 2003.

12 Groundwater monitoring. We do groundwater
13 monitoring quarterly. In the fourth quarter, the
14 sampling is happening right now. You might see white
15 trucks around the base where guys are taking samples.
16 The two previous reports are in the review process.

17 That's all I have to say.

18 MR. BERMAN: The last report had a good
19 executive summary.

20 MR. FORD: There is an annual. The quarter at
21 the end of year includes an annual summary report.
22 That's a good place to see where the action is as far as
23 groundwater goes. It would be a lot more efficient to
24 find it there than to go through the individual
25 quarterly reports.

1 MR. KERN: Thanks to Craig and George for
2 those updates.

3 On to Item No. 6, the regulatory agency status
4 updates and inputs. Bob?

5 MR. BOGGS: For those of you that are new, my
6 name is Bob Boggs, and I work for the Department of
7 Toxic Substances. My agency and James's Regional Water
8 Quality Control Board primarily oversee site cleanups in
9 the state. So we work together to double-check each
10 other, and we have different areas of expertise.

11 The regulation that governs site cleanups have
12 a little bit of separation, such that there are things
13 that his agency regulates or oversees that are covered
14 under his cleanup that are different than what my agency
15 focuses on. So my agency primarily focuses on what
16 Craig called "CERCLA contaminants." These would
17 primarily be nonpetroleum contaminants, any pesticides,
18 metals, and the PAH's that were talked about.

19 My agency has an actual agreement with the
20 Trust that basically is a binding agreement that
21 provides for my agency to oversee the cleanup. My
22 authority here is just to make sure that the Trust is
23 following the regulations in all work that they're doing
24 here at the cleanup.

25 As may have been mentioned, this RAB, this

1 Park down to San Jose and then west towards the Altamont
2 Pass and Livermore. So basically it defines the
3 watershed of the Bay Area -- the Delta and the Bay.

4 The main task of the Water Board is to protect
5 California's waters, their surface waters and their
6 drinking waters and to maintain them and preserve them
7 for future use.

8 My role here, as George pointed out, is pretty
9 much defined by what we have as board orders on sites.
10 A board order is a staff person like me making a
11 recommendation to our board, and our board is made up of
12 nine appointees by the governor. We have some
13 appointees that are left over from the previous
14 administration and others that were appointed by Gray
15 Davis. They represent different walks of life. We have
16 people that work in local government, people that are
17 may be in water supply. I write up the requirements of
18 an order with the findings and the facts and the
19 history. Someone like me will present it to them in a
20 public meeting, and then they get public testimony.
21 Then the board will vote whether to adopt the staff
22 person's recommendation. So I'm working with the legacy
23 of two orders that were adopted in the '90s for the
24 site.

25 As George pointed out, some things have

1 group -- I've worked on other military bases -- is one
2 of the most progressive anywhere in the state, and we
3 often get used as examples in other RABs as how things
4 should work.

5 Part of it is that we have very intelligent
6 RAB members that have been coming for years. They've
7 learned rather than just stopped the process, they been
8 very good at contributing to the process and helping
9 lead us forward to what's going to be the best cleanups
10 for the Presidio. So I feel very privileged to work
11 here and thank everybody on the RAB.

12 If anybody has any questions of me, I can
13 shout out my phone number if you want to write it down
14 and talk to me about the regulations or anything like
15 that. My number is 510-540-3751. Or if you have any
16 quick questions, I can answer them now.

17 MR. KERN: Thank you.

18 MR. PONTON: My name is Jim Ponton. I'm a
19 geologist for the State with the Water Board. I'll give
20 you my phone number before I forget to tell you. It's
21 510-622-2492. I work in Oakland.

22 The Water Board is a unique agency, in that
23 there's nine water boards throughout the State of
24 California. I work for Region II, which is San
25 Francisco Bay region and it extends from about Rohnert

1 remained the same but other things have changed. One of
2 my goals in the short term will be probably to combine
3 the two orders and update them so that they clearly show
4 that the Presidio Trust is named on the orders. Right
5 now, they're named under the Army. They're out of date.
6 And also it updates them for things that have been found
7 since they were originally adopted and things that are
8 no longer done, like the thermal treatment of soils. So
9 that's essentially my job.

10 I've been a regulator now for three years and
11 I was a petroleum geologist for about ten and a
12 environmental consultant for about ten.

13 MR. KERN: Item 7, "New Business." Is there
14 any new business?

15 Perhaps, Jan, would you be able to say what
16 might be the proposed process for new members?

17 MS. CHEEVER: Oh, yes. The membership
18 committee will get together again and do telephone
19 interviews with people that couldn't come tonight, and
20 then we'll get together and try to take our thirteen
21 semifinalists down to five or six finalists for a
22 recommendation for the January board meeting, and we'll
23 ask the people to join the RAB then.

24 Those that weren't selected, we obviously want
25 to keep around. We would like you to come to the

Page 77

1 meetings. People are always turning over on the RAB,
2 and we appreciate your interest very much.

3 MR. KERN: Any other new business?

4 Item 8. Several new documents out there.

5 Draft and sampling plans that are available in the
6 Presidio Trust library in Building 34. And I think
7 there are copies at our offices. Are they generally
8 available?

9 MR. COOPER: Correct.

10 MR. BERMAN: Is there any update on the
11 ability to make these available electronically?

12 MR. COOPER: We have it in a demo form right
13 now -- the first request was to make Presidio Trust
14 correspondence available through our website. For the
15 new members, maybe you've gone to our website already,
16 but the RAB asked us to create a link where you can
17 click on "environmental," and you can peruse what we
18 have there so far. We're in the process of creating a
19 link to that so you can see all of the correspondence
20 that the Presidio sends out to the regulatory agencies
21 and the Park Service regarding each of these remediation
22 processes. So that should be launched pretty soon. And
23 then after that, that database that we're setting up
24 will be compatible and able to accept documents in the
25 future. That'll be the second wave. We have some other

Page 79

1 MR. COOPER: Again, a lot of documents are
2 already on CD. Treadway and Rollo produces all of their
3 documents on CD now. So once you see an e-mail that
4 goes out, you can ask me if it's on CD and then you can
5 start the process.

6 MR. BERMAN: The RAB members don't have the
7 time to read them line by line. We can scan it and get
8 an idea of what it's about and feel more informed than
9 just the title.

10 MR. COOPER: Sure, you can peruse around and
11 look at some key figures and things like that.

12 MR. BERMAN: Downstream if that looks like
13 it's easy to do -- for instance, in Item A you've got
14 five documents now available in Building 34 library. It
15 would be nice if we came here and there were a few CDs
16 that we just pass out to those people that wanted them.

17 MR. FORD: I think we can do that.

18 MR. COOPER: The groundwater monitoring report
19 is on a CD. I think they are. I'm 99-percent sure the
20 groundwater monitoring report is on CD.

21 MR. FORD: That's the thing we have to look
22 at. I think that all the smaller RAPS and things do
23 come with a CD that's got the whole report -- the data,
24 the text, everything. The groundwater monitoring
25 reports might be different, but we can check into that.

Page 78

1 hurdles to cross before we do that, but we're slowly
2 inching toward the 21st century.

3 MR. BERMAN: What about this red herring on
4 ADA? Has that now been digested?

5 MR. COOPER: It hasn't been resolved, but how
6 to solve that problem? Let's try the correspondence
7 first and see if we can get that launched and then if
8 the correspondence makes it through all the other people
9 that will be monitoring the launching of this link then
10 we can start doing documents also.

11 MR. BERMAN: Finally, was there some
12 discussion about having these reports available on a CD?
13 Will that still be a possibility? So if they go down to
14 Building 34 and peruse that stuff --

15 MR. COOPER: A lot of our documents are
16 already on CDs. Not all of them, but many of them are.
17 You'd still have to go down to Building 34, and they can
18 check out the CD. You want me to e-mail? I guess I
19 could try to e-mail you the CD.

20 MR. O'HARA: I'll bet we could do better than
21 that, because the CD's are so cheap.

22 MR. BERMAN: If they're publicly available
23 they're so much easier rather than having to deal with a
24 hard copy. It's a lot cheaper than hard copy. I hope
25 you'll do that. I think you'll get more people.

Page 80

1 MR. KERN: At the risk of being hard-nosed
2 here, Sam is probably going to bring this up at every
3 meeting until he gets something.

4 MR. COOPER: Sam, send us an e-mail of
5 documents you would like to have an CD on, and I'll send
6 you the CD's.

7 MR. KERN: A couple of more action items that
8 have come up through suggestions by members of our
9 audience.

10 One suggestion that I wanted to make note of
11 was possibly at some point investigating vegetation and
12 trees on the periphery of Landfill E if that ever
13 becomes something. I think it's important to note that
14 somebody mentioned that as a possibility. And also
15 perhaps if it's discovered that we have something more
16 hazardous maybe in the Class I classification for waste
17 being hauled off the Presidio that may be [inaudible].
18 I don't know if that's required or necessary, but it
19 seemed like a reasonable idea. Any other action items?

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: Maps.

21 MR. KERN: Just that Craig is going to bring
22 maps in the future.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: And no committee meeting in
24 December.

25 MR. KERN: No committee meeting.

1 Items for January meeting should be forwarded
 2 to Mark. Any other items before we adjourn?
 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How does the board
 4 approve something? By vote or what? Majority vote?
 5 MR. KERN: That's a very interesting question
 6 that we face many times here at the RAB. The Army, for
 7 example, suggested that the RAB didn't have any power to
 8 do anything; and, of course, they weren't correct by
 9 that. But we have previously made resolutions at
 10 different times where the body will discuss things that
 11 they feel are important and just draft a resolution that
 12 can be made public.
 13 That's one way of voicing a concern. We have
 14 written letters to the Trust's board of directors in the
 15 past. And we've discussed things publicly that perhaps
 16 different agencies or bodies didn't want to go beyond
 17 this room. So it really depends on the item and what
 18 the appropriate action would be, but it has been
 19 letters, resolutions, discussion, things of that nature.
 20 MS. CHEEVER: We don't vote on everything.
 21 Out title says "advisory board," so perhaps we give
 22 advice just by bringing up concerns at meetings like
 23 this. And sometimes it's over individual concerns,
 24 maybe representing yourself and a group of people that
 25 you don't think necessarily all have the same concerns.

1 Then also another way that people submit their views is
 2 by commenting when there's public comment periods on
 3 those things. We don't have to comment as the RAB as a
 4 whole. We can comment as individuals, or some of us
 5 represent neighborhood groups or something like that.
 6 Also, anybody in the public can comment. You don't have
 7 to be on the RAB to comment. On occasion, if we are
 8 fairly unanimous or have a strong consensus we have
 9 taken the initiative to do something beyond that, such
 10 as circulating a comment that wouldn't be comment signed
 11 by a RAB member. But if it's not unanimous we would
 12 never say the RAB says this. The comment would be
 13 signed by individual RAB members.
 14 Then a few times we've had a resolution for
 15 things that have almost but not always been unanimous
 16 and they all have been circulated and discussed at
 17 several meetings. We often circulate things like that
 18 among ourselves by e-mail and fax and give everyone a
 19 chance to have input before we make it final.
 20 MR. KERN: Any other questions. Before we
 21 adjourn, I would like to thank you all the members of
 22 RAB for coming here tonight, members of audience to come
 23 here tonight. It's much appreciated. We really
 24 appreciate your interest and hope to see you again at
 25 future meetings.

1 Any other comments?
 2 Without objection then, meeting adjourned.
 3 Thank you.
 4 [Meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.]
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
 2 Jerry Anderson
 3 Sam Berman
 4 Bob Boggs, CA Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
 5 Edward F. Callahan, Jr.
 6 Julia Cheever
 7 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
 8 Tony Distefano
 9 Dennis Downing
 10 George Ford, Presidio Trust
 11 Joel Hermann
 12 Doug Kern
 13 Jan Monaghan
 14 Peter O'Hara
 15 James Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
 16 Gloria Yarros
 17 Mark Youngkin
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25